

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

DR. P. CARNEGIE SIMPSON is a great churchman and a recognized authority on all matters pertaining to Christian doctrine and ecclesiastical order as these are understood in the evangelical churches. In the Chalmers Lectures for 1934, delivered to the divinity students of the Church of Scotland, he has made a most notable contribution to a great subject. He writes in no polemical spirit, but with a weight of learning, a strong sanity, and breadth of view which are very impressive.

His lectures are published under the title of *The Evangelical Church Catholic* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). After an introductory lecture precedence is given to a lecture on 'the religion of the evangel,' for, as Archbishop Söderblom said, 'The first thing is the evangelic.' Of this lecture a brief outline may be given.

The word 'gospel' is one of those deceptive words the sound of which easily does duty for the reality. If, however, we seek to define it we may say in the most general terms that it is 'the answer to two fundamental questions. One is the question of the character of God, including His relationship to man, the other is that of the meaning of life, including its deliverance from what threatens to destroy and defeat it.'

The question for the gospel concerning God is not merely that of His existence. That does not carry us very far. The science of to-day shows

signs of being more favourable to a spiritual view of the universe, but 'a universe which is ultimately a mathematical formula—as we are told by science to-day the universe is—no more assures our spirits of their Divine Father, or gives our lives a Divine Friend and Saviour, than does a universe of "brute matter." . . . A gospel is needed to answer that in the scientific age of an Eddington and a Whitehead as much as it was needed in the scientific age of a Huxley or a Tyndall.'

The second question which a gospel must deal with is the problem of human life. And here we have to take account not only of the mystery, trouble, and sorrow which overshadow the human lot, but still more deeply of the fact that some 'moral poison' has infected human nature. 'Whether or not it arose through what the Churches call a "fall," and whether or not it is to be described as "sin"—a word hardly to be found in the modern vocabulary—it is there.' The evidence of its presence and of its blighting power is everywhere manifest, and because of it 'human life is not its own saviour and often is its own destroyer.' Neither intellectual knowledge nor material civilization is a cure for this. 'It needs a further word—the word of a gospel.'

This gospel is to be found in the fact of Christ. He is the answer to our questions about God, and He is the solution of the problem of human life. It must be clearly kept in view that this gospel is



essentially personal; it is Christ Himself. And the Church, to which the stewardship of the gospel has been committed, must ever guard against depersonalizing it. This happens when the chief emphasis is laid on the Church as an institution, or when the gospel is conceived as a matter of doctrinal propositions. It also happens when the gospel is conceived as subjective religious emotion, or intellectualized as a mere scheme of ideals or an ethical system. 'I had rather preach,' said Principal Denney, 'with a crucifix in my hand and the feeblest power of moral reflection than have the finest insight into ethical principles and no Son of God who came by blood.'

---

The response to this gospel, that is the response to Christ Himself, may be as varied as the variety of human nature. 'The Christ has been one; the contacts have been many. There have been those with whom the *nexus* is a definite and conscious conversion; those for whom it is the sacraments; those in whom it is an uneventful but real growth as life goes on; those to whom it is the experience of the "inner light"; those to whom it is by the practical service of humanity for Christ's sake and in His name. Of all such, He who is the evangel says, "Him that cometh to Me"—by any way—"I will in no wise cast out." Every way that really leads to and ends in Christ is essentially evangelical; and His gospel is as large as His own Personality.'

---

While this is true, and urgently needing to be said in certain quarters, ultra-evangelical as well as ultra-ecclesiastical, at the same time it is true that the evangelical message has often been obscured and distorted by being presented in wrong ways. Accordingly we must consistently affirm what we believe to be the character of the genuine religion of the evangel, and set forth that version of it which seems to be most in accord with the mind and spirit of Christ. There are, it will be found, 'three characteristics of the genuine religion of the evangel—of the way, that is, in which the evangelical Christian responds to the gospel about God and about life which is in Christ.'

The first is a sense of infinite indebtedness to God for the gift of Jesus Christ. 'This, more than anything, gives to evangelical religion what may be called its attitude, which is the attitude of one who, in Christ, has received from God what he has neither made nor merited.' Distinctions are drawn between ethical and non-ethical religions, but an equally great distinction is to be drawn between 'religions of ethic in which we attain a greater or less degree of merit, and the religion of the evangel, in which, in the first place, God gives to us and does so even when we have done ill.' Christianity, while it is of course ethical, is primarily and distinctively the religion of the God who so loved the world that He gave. 'It is the sense of this which strikes in evangelical religion the indebtedness of which I am speaking. . . . A man who has no appreciation of it, though he may be in many ways a good man and a Christian, has hardly seen the gospel and has certainly not yet felt it.'

---

The second characteristic is an entire trust in Christ and in Him alone. 'The God who is revealed in Christ and who gave us Christ can be relied on as really friendly to us and as more than friendly—as forgiving and loving and our Father; and to this about the character of God we can hold, despite many unsolved mysteries and problems in the world and in life, and despite, also, the fears of our own hearts and the accusations of our consciences.' The simplicity of this, however, is continually in danger of being obscured, on the one hand by legalism, on the other hand by ecclesiastical formalism. Legalism says we must make good our standing before God by racial privilege as among the Jews, or by working up a moral credit balance as in Luther's day. Ecclesiastical formalism asserts that only through certain channels and certain persons can the free grace of God be guaranteed to come. 'Of these systems it must be said that a God who will receive men only if they have in their hands a racial passport or a moral bank-book with a credit balance of good works, or who, further, will deal with them only through certain official channels, is not other than a *different kind of Person* from the Father pictured in Christ, who is waiting for His prodigal and bankrupt children, and is ready



to meet them whenever and wherever and however they turn to Him.'

The third characteristic is 'a loyalty of life to Christ.' By that is meant an obedience which is given in a spirit of freedom, and which is not prescribed and controlled by rule, but is inspired and guided by love. St. Paul is much concerned about the maintaining of the liberty which we have in Christ. He will not suffer it to be cribbed and confined by any system of external regulations. This freedom has always been viewed with suspicion by the ecclesiastical mind. Undoubtedly it has its dangers, and there are timid souls who feel more secure when they have surrendered their wills to the keeping of some external authority. But it is not to this that the gospel calls us, but to the obedience of free men in Christ. In other words, human personality is not only respected in Christ, but developed. It is not to be questioned that 'in many cases, this surrender of the things which constitute personality may be made with sincere consecration of spirit. But it is not the response to the gospel which we see in the New Testament. The religion of the evangel is not of this kind. It is the religion of a loyalty to Christ which is safeguarded, not by external rule, but in personal love, and is free because its law is the spirit of Christ in the heart, in whom we find, not only our salvation, but ourselves.'

In his recently published volume on *Christian Theology*, Dr. A. C. HEADLAM, Bishop of Gloucester, has given to the world the lectures which theological students were fortunate to receive from him while he was a Professor of Divinity. The volume contains a comparatively elaborate account of the history of the Christian Doctrine of God, and more especially of the History of Christology. One turns with interest to the concluding chapter in which Dr. HEADLAM indulges in reflections upon the way he has traversed.

What is the value, he asks, of the erudition which such instruction is designed to impart? Has it any practical utility? Is it not religion that men

require, not theology? Should we not preach an undogmatic Christianity?

The first consideration Dr. HEADLAM would have us notice is that, although their influence is not always realized, intellectual conceptions are of paramount importance in life. Religion, if it is to be of real influence upon life, must satisfy the intellect as well as the emotions. The first words of the Lord's Prayer, 'Our Father,' are simple enough from a religious point of view, but they contain a fundamental dogmatic truth. Indeed no one's religion, however simple it may be, can be independent of dogmatic questions. A clergyman who has not studied dogmatic questions will hardly be able to meet the religious difficulties which often trouble quite simple people.

A second consideration is that Christian truth demands restatement from time to time. The intellectual conceptions of mankind are constantly changing. There was restatement in the time of the Schoolmen and again at the time of the Reformation. But if the gospel message is to be commended to-day, it should be in the language, not of the thirteenth or the sixteenth, but of the twentieth century. For this we must know what the gospel message is, what are the fundamental truths of the Christian tradition.

The fundamental truths which we have to teach are belief in God, belief in Jesus Christ, and belief in the Holy Spirit. And it is because the doctrine of the Trinity guards carefully all these truths that the Church adheres so closely to what some have thought an irrational creed. But even in itself the doctrine of the Trinity has always made an appeal to the religious consciousness as guarding the mysteriousness of the universe.

Belief in God is of necessity expressed in human language, much of which must be symbolical and relative, but in relation to the moral attributes of God nothing relative or symbolical must be allowed. Our moral instincts are the strongest proofs of God's existence, and the mercy, justice, and love of God must be real, and higher than ours. It should be



the aim of Christian ministers to make belief in God real and vital. For this a sound intellectual grip of theistic belief is required.

Belief in Jesus Christ is summed up in the Incarnation and the Atonement, and no belief in Him is adequate which does not guard the reality of revelation and the reality of redemption. Unless Jesus Christ be really God, He cannot reveal God or redeem man. That is why the belief in the true divinity of Christ is fundamental. The lofty conception of God that we must inevitably form at the present day makes us feel that God must be brought nearer to us, and that is what Christ effects through His life and teaching.

Belief in the Holy Spirit is one of the most fundamental facts of individual religion. All religious people have the feeling that God speaks to them in their hearts and souls. But we should not forget the corporate aspect of the Holy Spirit—the Spirit as inspiring and guiding the Church. Because we believe that the Spirit has guided the Church in ages gone by, we accept the fundamental truths that have always been taught on the authority of the Church, although we cannot limit the action of the Holy Spirit to the past. The belief in the Spirit as working now as in the past through inspired human intellects is vital to the Church.

There are two questions that even believing Christians sometimes ask themselves: What reason or reasons have we for believing that Christ is living? And, secondly, what distinction is there between an experience of a living Christ and an experience of a living God? With regard to the former question, as Dr. A. C. McGIFFERT points out in *Christianity as History and Faith*, reviewed elsewhere, it is not enough to furnish the proofs that Christ did actually rise from the dead nineteen hundred years ago.

Unless the event is vitally connected with the age in which we live, unless it has a vital significance for our modern life, it is not easy to see how we can go on accepting it indefinitely. The case is

parallel with that of the belief in God. The old Deistic idea of God as a Being who once created the world and then took His hands off and left it to run without any interference from Him led inevitably to atheism. If God is not present and active, He might as well be dispensed with altogether. And so there came the belief in Divine Immanence. God was brought back into the life of the world. Even so, if the resurrection of Christ were an isolated event, it would in the end come to mean nothing. If the belief is to be a reality it must become part and parcel of the life of to-day.

'It is my own conviction that the Resurrection is vitally concerned with our age—that it really means a living Christ still active and powerful among us.' In what way, and by what means is His presence shown? we may ask. And Dr. McGIFFERT shows us how. One way is to be seen in the advancing ethical ideals of our time. We are to-day witnessing a tremendous growth in Christian ideals. They are dynamic, full of life, and developing all the time to meet our modern conditions. And they are Christian ideals.

The Christian conscience of to-day is sensitive on many matters on which the conscience of our fathers was obtuse—slavery, the drink and drug traffic, religious liberty, the emancipation of women, the economic status of the working classes, the relations of capital and labour. It is quite certain our ideals are rising. And it is as certain that the spirit of Christ is behind them and behind their development. Is Christ still alive and present with us? What more could He do if He were here in the flesh? Is not His spirit moving forward with us in the great advances of the human spirit?

Secondly, the living Christ is to be found in our Christian faith in the future, in our faith in a better world still to be—a faith often derided yet the real secret of all the moral advance we are making. What does this faith mean if not a living instead of a dead Christ? Faith in a better future does not arise out of the earth as we know it. The world to-day is full of the most depressing disillusionments. The idea of a mechanical and



necessary progress is, as Dean Inge so often reminds us, a baseless one. Faith in progress comes from a living Christ, and it is a faith in which are rooted the labour and the sacrifice that will alone make those better things actual. It is Christ who creates the faith that is never satisfied but is ever reaching forth to better things.

Further, there is also moral power here that testifies to living force and not mere dead futility. It is certain that multitudes of people find in Christ inspiration and strength for daily living. Could the inspiration be any greater, and the pressure of spirit on spirit more compelling if Christ were actually with us in the flesh? Not thus do we follow the dead. Only as for us is any one alive, only so far can he dominate our lives as Christ still dominates the lives of His disciples.

Once more, and just as truly, Christ is known in a type of experience like that which came to the man on the way to Emmaus. If Christ were with

us, would not our hearts burn within us, would we not feel the joy of His presence, even if our eyes were holden and we did not see Him? And is not this experience of joy and inspiration the experience of those who are doing Christ's work, following in His footsteps, living in His spirit? Is there not something about it that transcends the common life? This is fellowship with a living Christ.

And then comes the question: Is not this the same as fellowship with God? How do you distinguish the two? The answer is: it is the same, and we do not distinguish them. 'I for one cannot distinguish in my own experience between the living God and the living Christ. It is the experience of Christians that, as they find God in the Jesus of the Gospels, so now they find Him in the living Christ, working out His divine purposes, illuminating the minds of His children, imparting to them of His power, kindling their joy, offering Himself for fellowship with them as they respond by giving themselves eagerly and gladly to the doing of His will.'

## Jesus as a Poet Teacher.

BY THE REVEREND CANON J. M. C. CRUM, M.A., CANTERBURY.

In April 1925 died Professor C. F. Burney, who had written in the previous December the preface of his book, *The Poetry of our Lord*. He was not there to fight its battles, and the attack on his position, and the defence of it are largely the exclusive business of Aramaic scholars, and yet, the question whether our Lord did adopt for His teaching the use of poetry is one which must have suggested itself to many who know no Aramaic, and a consideration of what is implied in Professor Burney's hypothesis is of such many-sided interest, that an essay may be allowed to discuss the subject from a general view of it.

And, first of all, it is worth while to ask, what is poetry? A poet is a poet because he has something quite unprosaic to say, but what is it that distinguishes his sayings as poetry? Where do his

ordinary sayings leave off and where does the poetry begin? What constitutes a poem?

Would you not say that when you classify sayings as 'poems' you are satisfied that their form has conformed to some conventional law. Under the stress of the thinker and speaker's feeling, he must have been moved to use a kind of dancing of words to express himself. His language must have moved with an energy and vitality as different from ordinary talk as dancing is from ordinary walking. It must have been set in such a motion as is free and yet requires and accepts and welcomes laws to move by, as dancing does. In any poem you are aware of a tension between two tendencies, there is some kind of convention observed, some rhythm of stresses or syllables, some formal mould of lines or stanzas, some ornament of alliteration or rhymes.



There is some formal law which, as it were, frames the work : looser in an old English ballad, stricter in a sonnet of William Wordsworth :

the prison, unto which we doom  
Ourselves, no prison is . . .

You look up and notice, *room, loom, bloom, doom, cells, citadels, jells, foxglove bells* : and there are exactly fourteen lines : and every line has its five stresses : here is a great law-abiding of the poet. And yet you must all the while know he is free. He is not a prisoner : not a slave : not a drudge. You could read the line,

Nuns fret not at their convent's narrow room,  
as if it went on all fours with Gray's,

The lowing herd winds slowly o'er the lea,

and the sonnet would have become more prison-like, or you could beat out the rhythm with monotonous stresses so that the hearer would join the ranks of those whose ear is weary of all singsonging poetry.

Part of the poeticalness of true poetry is that the free and spirited words and meaning are always pulling against the coercion of the forms which restrain and order them. If the meaning had not the spirit to do this, the verse would become doggerel. If it broke clean away, it would cease to be poetry, on the other side.

And different races and peoples and poets and times have had different conventional forms. One must sympathize with each workman and understand his self-imposed limitations, or his poetry will not appeal to me and stay with my memory, as poetry. And of course the practical usefulness of poetry is that it gives to thought this power of abiding in our memory. The words (as I hear people say nowadays, not very poetically) 'stay put.' The poem is like the song-thrush of Robert Browning, which says the same phrase again, and can 'recapture' its former 'rapture.'

I suppose that all English hearers and lovers of the Bible, of the Psalms, the Prophecies, and the rest, have, by now, got into their English constitutions an alien, but now adopted and naturalized, Semitic sense of a poetry not very like their own. Whether we analyse it or not, the thought and feeling of us begins to move as to a stately measure when we say some Psalm or listen to some chapter of Job. Or we move in a slower and duller movement as they read the Proverbs or Ecclesiasticus to us. And when we do analyse the laws of the movement which has for us a lifelong familiarity,

we can see that even in the translation of it, the Hebrew has a certain, not very strict, measure of stresses. The number of words that matter is dealt out to us, more or less, by measure. And, again, we can feel a constant balancing of the sentences one against another. They are so often running in pairs, for example. And one half of a thought is balanced over against the other half. This supplements that ; or, this contrasts itself with that.

There are the two conventions of our Old Testament poetry—the stresses measured, and the parallelism. If there was rhyme, or alliteration, of course, for us, that has gone.

Now any one who grows up with his Old and New Testament beside him must become more and more aware of the continuity of the thought from the Old into the New. Much happened between the close of the Old volume and the opening of the New. Much that we find in the atmosphere of the mind of Jesus and the first Christians may have been equally present to the minds of all pious Jewish people. I am thinking, for example, of the sense of the Fatherhood of God. But the connexion, though broken, is continuous enough. Jesus of Nazareth is felt to be alive with a life which is in the tradition of Isaiah's great chapters (I'll name chs. 40-54). There can be no doubt that the words of the best loved Psalms were an element in the making of the mind of Jesus. The poetry which still moves us, although it comes to us as a foreigner, was to dwellers in Nazareth or Capernaum the normal poetry. Poetry was that : a thing of stresses and parallelism. And, I suppose, one may take for granted that alongside with that classical sacred poetry of the Hebrew people, there would be popular singings and verses that a crowd would like and remember—as indeed Jesus lets us hear the children's chanting at their Hebrew game, with stresses, and with parallels,

We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced,  
We have mourned to you, and ye have not wept.

If I am in search of a poetry of Jesus, I must labour to discover what words of His are still authentically preserved for me, and I must allow them to tell their own story, in this aspect also, and, as they lie there, we will see whether there is traceable in them any sign that Jesus, for the purpose of securing a memory of them, cast them in the form of homely Semitic verse : so that people who had neither reading nor writing might be able to carry them in their mind and have them by heart.

The question raised concerns us in two ways. For



if our Lord did teach by giving out Sayings which were poems, then we have a new security that our Sayings of Jesus are authentic. We can know what kind of thing He said and some of the very words He did say. But again, if these Sayings are deliberate compositions of Jesus, then the scenes in which they are set will have to reset themselves for us. Jesus will not seat Himself on the Mount and speak St. Matthew's three chapters as a continuous speech or sermon. And, again, the scene of some healing or some instruction to the disciples will very likely have grown up so as to frame and contain the Saying. The poem will be more authentic than the circumstances in which the story sets it. On the other hand, if it is supposed that the Lord spoke so, in unpremeditated conversation, saying impromptu poetry, we have to adjust our minds once more to a foreign, but not necessarily an unnatural, scene. I may as well say at once that it has grown upon me to receive our records as having only gradually formed themselves into the scenes as we receive them. Often, I suppose, what is most original and authentic is some words of our Lord which by their form have been preserved for us,

No man that puts his hand to the plough  
And turns to look behind him  
Is fit for the kingdom of God.

Foxes have earths,  
And the birds of the air have nests,  
But the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head.

It is not unthinkable that the words were spoken, in either case, without premeditation, yet, each time, they conform to the requirements of Semitic poetry. I have been thinking what would have been an English equivalent for the second. Professor Burney puts it into four lines of Aramaic, the couplets rhyme, and the rhythm is three stresses to each line. As regards the mere form of the Saying it is as though some one answered in English, something of this kind :

The fox's house has earthen eaves,  
The birds sleep canopied with leaves,  
But the Son of Man must homeless lie  
With never a roof but the open sky.

This is Lk 10. And in Lk 11, where the unbelievers say that it is by Beelzebub that our Lord casts out devils, our Lord answers with two stanzas, alluding to the name Beelzebub, or Lord of the House. One is the strong man keeping his house and attacked by a stronger than he, and the other is the house from which its tenant goes and returns

to find it empty. The parallelism which was so noticeable in line answering line is here found in stanza answering stanza, and the impression made is of a Saying remembered because it had been so formulated as to endure in people's minds.

The same two-stanza composition appears several times. Though the parts of it are broken from each other, it is recoverable in Mt 12<sup>28</sup> 11<sup>21</sup> and Lk 11<sup>29</sup> 10<sup>13</sup>. One stanza of the Men of Nineveh and Jonah, and the other of The Queen of the South and Solomon.

Or, again, in Lk 15 you find parallel stanzas, if I may call them that, of the Shepherd and his lost sheep and the girl and her lost piece of silver.

It is even natural to bring together paragraphs which are now quite separated. I think of the Friend who knocks at midnight asking for loaves (11<sup>8</sup>) and the woman who gives the unjust judge no peace (18<sup>2</sup>). They seem to have belonged to some teaching about prayer. Or there are the two passages each of which ends with the refrain :

Every one that exalteth himself shall be abased,  
And he that abaseth himself shall be exalted.

The forward guest, of Lk 14<sup>8-11</sup>, and the Pharisee in the Temple, of Lk 18<sup>9-14</sup>—our editor has felt free to separate them, but the Parable of the Guest who was rebuked gains a meaning which somehow seemed wanting where it stands alone. If there were among the first Christians these Sayings of Jesus, and if they are the most authentic of our earliest records, that will involve us in adjustments, in rearrangements. But it is of inestimable value to possess what they have preserved for us.

I will venture to say that it is these very sayings which have, as one would have expected, everywhere by their own quality, convinced men that they are authentic: the separate poems, for example, which have come to be, for us, the Sermon on the Mount, or the Mission of the disciples which remains for us in Matthew and Luke and in Mark. The instinct of men has been to recognize them as original. They are their own evidence of authenticity. But the Aramaic scholars reassure, though they do not surprise, the English reader, when they say, for example, that Mt 11<sup>28-30</sup> runs quite simply into Aramaic verse :

Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden  
And I will refresh you.

Take my yoke upon you,

And learn of me ;

For I am meek and lowly in heart,

And ye shall find rest for your souls.

For my yoke is easy,

And my burden is light.



So Professor Burney divides the lines for his Aramaic stresses, and another Aramaic scholar, J. Armitage Robinson, notices that our word 'meek' when it goes back to its own language recovers its native sense of 'restful,' and the restful one will give you rest' giving the quiet mind that calmly serves. The saying is more at home as it gets back to the language in which it would have been spoken if it had been a kind of song composed by Jesus of Nazareth for His first followers.

The subject is an inexhaustible one, but I will take, to end with, the Lord's Prayer. To Professor Burney this is poetical in form: two stanzas of three lines each: each line having four stresses.

When he passes from rhythm to the more uncertain question of rhyme, he has the twelve half-lines rhyming, in his conjectural translation, thus:

half-line 1 and half-line 5 have the same ending.

half-lines 2, 3, 4 rhyme with one another.

half-lines 7-11, and half-lines 8, 9, 10 rhyme.

half-lines 6 and 12 rhyme.

The facts seem to be singularly like those observed in the case of Sura i. of the Koran. There Mr. Rodwell gives in English lettering a representation of the Arabic words, warning the reader that 'in Arabic as in Italian' rhyme is scarcely avoidable. Here is the English:

Praise be to God, Lord of the [three] worlds! [that is, of heaven, earth, hell].

The compassionate, the merciful! [that is borrowed from the synagogue]

King on the day of reckoning!

Thee only do we worship, and to thee do we cry for help.

Guide thou us on the straight path,

The path of those to whom thou hast been gracious;  
With whom thou art not angry, and who go not astray.

In the Arabic these seven lines have unequal stresses, the last line is a kind of threefold line with a long 'Ameen' added. Lines 1, 3, 6 end with long 'eem's,' 2, 5, 7 end with equally long-drawn 'een's,' and then the 'Ameen.' I do not think that any one who has heard it chanted can doubt that what has commended this, as a piece of language, to those human Muhammadan hearts and memories is its rhythm, and its assonance: its consonants (its r's and l's) and its vowels: all these have assisted in the appeal of the solemn plaintive thought, the self-abandonment of man to the compassionate and merciful majesty of God: man's soul like a

camel-driver beseeching that in the wilderness of the world he may not be lost. Here is one of the prayers which an illiterate people learned from a prophet who speaks of writing with ink as one of God's own miracles (Sura xcvi.). If his work is not to be called poetry, the name suffers by the limitation. And this prayer which is used by some two hundred millions of people, is a sort of parallel of the Lord's Prayer. For the Lord's Prayer, too, has its own poetical form. If you say 'thy' or 'our,' and so on, in Aramaic, it appears, rhyming is there at once. All you may say is that rhyme has been allowed, not avoided. But even in English or Latin or Greek, you are aware of rhythm, of form. It is a form imposed upon it by the thoughts it speaks. It is the words a human heart must say when it is in that Presence: Our Father who art in heaven. One cannot count or measure the stress or weight of that. But the sound is balanced, after the three desires (Thy name, Thy kingdom, Thy will) by the 'as in heaven, so on earth.' And the second stanza, with its corresponding assonances, looks, in the light of the first, to all life, not in heaven but on earth. The light of the opening words enables man to look to this earth of our daily bread, and of the wretchedness of man (as man makes this life on earth) with so great a need of being forgiven and of being forgiving, and, lower still, it looks into the dread of what may come—the temptation: the evil. It has faced all life. It is surely the greatest poem that ever was made.

Set it beside the Koran prayer, its difference declares itself. But the similarity of literary form—if it is possible to use the word 'literary' of either of these spontaneous, great, simple compositions—is illuminating. They seem to prove that there is a universal need of poetry in the human heart; that none could have been the Universal Man, the Son of Man, unless, just as He was a Son, a working man, one who loved children, who watched the sky, who felt for the birds, one who longed to protect the weak and heal the bruised and help the blind, one who loved His country, who honoured the wise and true of ancient days, who would look into the future as life beyond this life: I say, none could be the Son of Man unless, besides all these qualities without which human nature would be so far deficient, He had also had those qualities which make us say of some one: he is a poet, seeing the world poetically, saying poetically what he has to say.



## Things most certainly Believed.

### V.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES BLACK, D.D., ST. GEORGE'S WEST, EDINBURGH.

BEING only what is vaguely termed 'a working minister,' I am forced to discuss this question somewhat differently, and certainly at a different angle, from the three distinguished professors and theologians who, at the moment of my writing, have already contributed to this series. I have appreciated very highly their brilliant articles, which seem to me to be particularly helpful especially to ministers and people of experienced Christian standing. At the same time I dare to suggest that none of us in our active ministry could either begin or end just where they do in speaking on such a topic to the thinking young men and women of our congregations who are reading the popular literature and science of our day. For instance, to put the matter much more bluntly than I should like to do, few of us could dare limit ourselves to Dr. Dodd's great question, 'How God can be in Christ': I fear we should be forced again and again by the very questions our young people put to us to ask the prior and deeper question—*what reasonable grounds have we for believing in a personal God at all?* I do not say this in any critical spirit, but only because the religious situation we have constantly to face demands that we should rest our appeal to modern people on some assurance of basal things which we may ask them to believe as eminently reasonable. Every working minister, especially those who have anything to do with reading and thinking laymen, however raw they may be—and they are worst when they are most raw!—will agree with me that when people come to talk to us about religious difficulties, the focus of their troubles is generally the being of God, and especially what kind of God one can reasonably accept in a world like this. That may seem terribly amateurish; but I can assure you that to thousands it is terribly real. A little science is a dangerous thing—and especially its unsupported repercussions on all types of idealistic belief! Some months ago—I give this only as an instance of what a minister may have to face and of what young people are thinking—I was asked to take part in a discussion by some students on 'The Basis of Morality'; and it was not a question of 'higher and lower'

forms of morality, but whether morality as such had any other ground of acceptance than 'social contract' or a popular agreement for human decency. Hence, to put the business quite plainly, were we to announce that we would speak on 'Things most certainly Believed,' our audience would expect us to begin much 'further ben' than any of the excellent papers I have read.

This is my apology, then, for the kind of paper I am venturing to write. In a disturbed world like this, where the firm and regulative beliefs of other days are so gravely shaken and where earnest people are painfully seeking some grounds of personal assurance, we are forced to ask what we may put before puzzled inquirers as the substance of 'reasonable belief,' something on which they may proceed to build a spiritual life, intellectually respectable and stable. In other words, can we justify our Christian system as a 'reasonable faith' for the men and women of to-day, reasonable from our knowledge of observed facts, from all decent and just inference, and from the implications of the kind of souls we have and are?

Let me begin where I have to begin with so many inquirers, and where practically I had to begin myself when my own feet were shaken. I find, in summary, that we have to make a man a *Theist* before we can hope to make him a *Christian*. That this should be so is not in itself unreasonable: for Jesus Himself based all His own claims on the prior 'Fatherhood of God.' I am quite certain that the most fruitful approach to the majority of people who are outside the Church to-day is through God to Christ rather than through Christ to God. It may be that Jesus is the final proof of the Fatherhood of God; but unless we have some reasonable belief that there is a God who can be a Father at all, there is no room for Jesus in the average man's thinking. At least, that is what I have found to be the case. For instance, we talk deplorably of the lost sense of sin or the lost sense of morality everywhere; but do these not ultimately depend on something more foundational, the *lost belief in the reality of God?* All Christ's claims for Himself centre in the Fatherhood of God; but if the



Fatherhood of God does not seem either a reasonable or a living belief to the men and women of to-day, what chance is there for Jesus? Our greatest need, both for the world and the Church, is to bring back a living faith in God, the Lord and Father, into man's thinking and planning.

To do this, I know, is not, and never can be, a matter of proof, as we use that abused term; but I am certain that from the facts of ascertained knowledge, from conscience, and from experience, we can uphold it as the only reasonable and satisfying explanation of these twin mysteries, the universe and ourselves.

1. From our knowledge of facts, we have good reason to believe that we live in a *universe*, what is philosophically called a 'cosmos' as opposed to either chaos or chance, a continuous realm of amazing extent and complexity where what we term 'laws' seem to hold with unvarying regularity. Wherever our exploring minds or telescopes can go, we seem to observe a universe where what we must recognize as order, law, principle, or 'mind' apparently prevails. This may only be a delusion on our part, or at best an inference; and yet we must admit that it is on this 'presumed order' that our very ability to reason depends. Hence, in our thinking and our daily calculations, we invariably regard this world as a *rational order*; in fact, what we call 'science' is not only the means by which we obtain knowledge about this world, but is itself our best proof that a reasoned order prevails; for all our experimentation is based on one simple fact—that we are dealing with a coherent and unified whole which we can know and study. Science itself is our best proof of two things: (1) that this is really a rational order with which we have to deal, and (2) that on any hypothesis of origins it is really idle to deny 'mind' in this world. For if, as some assert, we human beings can be fully accounted for as the products of natural processes, then we ourselves are the final proof that there is 'mind' of some sort in and through this universe. We at least have this thing we call intelligence: we can reason and think; and if evolution has produced such things as we call our minds, that is a plain answer to any questioning about the presence of 'mind' in this world.

2. I believe it is a reasonable inference, of which we can be intellectually and morally sure, that a universe like this, which we are forced to recognize as a rational order, and where 'law' seems to us to be a first principle, cannot just be the outcome of what we slackly call 'chance,' and certainly cannot be satisfactorily explained to our intellect by any

theory of chance. In Lotze's phrase, cosmos cannot be thought of as having chaos for its crown—or indeed for its origin! In a strict sense, 'chance' as such never can be thought of as having any *law*: the very word means the denial of law. I know that we speak popularly of the 'laws of chance'; but that is only a rather foolish phrase to cover things we cannot account for *that occur in a world of law*! In my own mind—(I admit this is only an inference, but I claim it is reasonable)—to say that such a universe as modern science has revealed to us is the outcome of 'chance,' 'a fortuitous concourse of atoms,' makes more demand on faith, and even credulity, than any religious explanation of the world ever given. A faith in a ruling Mind may have its difficulties; but for every one that faith meets, disbelief makes a dozen. The kind of mind we have cannot find a satisfying and reasonable explanation of the observed world of men and things except by positing *something akin to itself* everywhere. This is not the demand of faith, but the demand of intelligence.

3. Thus we believe—or shall I say, infer—that the only reasonable explanation of the ordered world we believe to be 'rational' is the religious postulate—a *Creating Mind*. We call this, in our hackneyed phrase, 'the great religious hypothesis'—but it is certainly a reasonable and satisfying hypothesis. Let us admit that it is a hypothesis; for it is increasingly obvious to thinking people that we can never hope to *prove* God, as we use that word 'prove' in our modern strict sense. That is why religion must always fall back on faith; but it is a faith, not against reason, but actually based on our ascertained knowledge and on reasonable inference. Fortunately—though I think it is hazardous to adopt the aid of such a questionable ally—I am glad that we may say that this affirmation of a creating mind is not only a religious but also a *scientific* affirmation to-day. I question if there was ever a time when our most approved scientific thinkers were more favourable to a spiritual explanation and interpretation of the universe than they are at present. The much-quoted Sir James Jeans has asserted that as a scientific observer he is forced to say that the world seems to him less of a Mechanism than a Thought, and he has alleged that he discovers everywhere signs of what he has called a Mathematical Mind. Professor Eddington has summed up his own position as follows: 'Science does not indicate whether the world-spirit is good or evil: but it does perhaps justify us in applying the adjective "creative." It



is for other considerations to examine the daring hypothesis that the spirit in whom we have our being—our actuality—is approachable to us: that He is to us the beneficent Father, without which, it seems to me, the question of the theoretical existence of a God has little significance.' Thus I think it is not an exaggeration to say that our religious and scientific reflection forces us to infer, as a reasonable and satisfying hypothesis, indeed the only reasonable and satisfying hypothesis, what Professor Eddington has called a 'creative spirit.'

4. All this is greatly to the good in many ways, and it certainly represents a changed atmosphere from the air we breathed when I was passing through college. (Then, with Huxley, Tyndall, and Haeckel as exponents of the 'theories' of science—by the way, has science a right to any 'theories' at all?—the bias was definitely mechanistic and anti-religious.) And yet, can one speak so confidently of a 'creative spirit' as Professor Eddington does, and merely stop there? It reminds me a little of the amusement with which I used to read Herbert Spencer. As we know, he had little or no use for the term 'God,' but instead spoke rather easily of something he called a 'Primal Force' or a 'First Cause.' But just as easily, he attributed to this so-called 'First Cause' certain conceptions (such as intelligence, aim, or process) of which, by the very nature of our experience, you and I can have no possible notion *except in connexion with a Personal Being!* He spoke, for instance, of intelligence as an observed attribute of this shadowy 'First Cause.' But intelligence, as we know it, does not float about *in vacuo*, like a cloud: our only knowledge of intelligence, and indeed our only possible working conception of intelligence, is through the thinking mind of a personal spirit like ourselves. Hence after Spencer had defined his 'Primal Force' and had given it the various attributes and qualities his own thought demanded, I often failed to see any real difference between him and me except that he consistently dodged using the name God! In the same way, can we say that science justifies the adjective 'creative spirit,' and yet stop there? After all, what is a Creative Spirit, which exhibits something which we take to be intelligence and mind, except a rather diminished name for what we call in the Christian faith the personal spirit of God? This, then, is a legitimate inference of our Christian faith—an inference of necessary reason, I think—that this Creative Mind which we discern in, through, and above the universe can be best thought of by us as a *personal God* who has revealed Himself and

His will in us and in the world, and whose mind we, as reasoning spirits ourselves, can increasingly know.

5. Thus we think it not only reasonable, but obligatory, to speak of the Creative Spirit of modern thinking as the Personal God, with whom we, being personal spirits ourselves, are able to commune, like with like. We believe that He is *knowable*; and to put it at its lowest, He must be at least as *ethical* as the best of us, His creatures, have it in us to be! We are all aware that there are many difficulties in adopting the anthropomorphic idea of calling God a 'person.' But are not most of the difficulties in this notion due to our faulty ideas of what 'personality' really is—ideas of limitation, localization, and imperfection? We believe that there is no contradiction in thought in ascribing a true personality to the infinite mind of God. Just as personality, even as we know it imperfectly, always grows by what it takes in, appropriates, knows, and controls—that is, not by what it excludes but includes—so we can justly say that the one perfect personality conceivable to our minds is one that knows all, understands all, and even controls all. There is nothing intellectually unsound in the Christian statement that God is a personal spirit, infinite, eternal, and all-perfect.

6. I quoted Professor Eddington as follows: '... the beneficent Father, without which, it seems to me, the question of the theoretical existence of a God has little significance.' I think this brings us definitely to 'the things most certainly believed' by Christian people. We believe in a true Fatherhood of God, without which, as we must agree with Eddington, 'the question of the theoretical existence of a God has little significance.' It is of little meaning to me to say that God exists: I want to know *what kind of God exists*. This brings us to the religious, and especially to the Christian, affirmation—the beneficent and loving Fatherhood of God. It would be idle to say that we owe this doctrine entirely to Jesus: many other religions and other earlier thinkers have spoken of God as the Father of men. Jesus spoke of this view as if it were already known and accepted by His audience. But there can be no doubt that the full revelation of God's Fatherhood to all men (so different in quantity as to be different in quality) is the special gift of Jesus to our thinking. Unless I can believe in this divine Fatherhood of the Eternal Spirit, I see little place for anything else, not even for Jesus. I may have come to know God through Jesus, as undoubtedly I have. And yet it is not He who



makes God's Fatherhood credible; but God's Fatherhood and love that make Him and His mission credible. Unless I believe that God in His heart so loved the world, I cannot understand the life and cross and victory of Christ. I become more and more convinced that the 'thing to be most certainly believed' by Christians to-day, even if they would find a place for Jesus in their thinking, is the perfect and loving Fatherhood of God. It is this yearning Fatherhood, expressing itself as all our conceptions of Fatherhood must do, that makes 'revelation' of any kind thinkable; and it is this same Fatherhood that makes 'incarnate love,' as seen in the life of Jesus, either possible or credible. Christ Himself banked every claim He made on this—and so must we.

A real 'working minister'—forgive the invidious phrase—could mention many objections that are commonly levelled at him regarding our belief in God's Fatherhood. The commonest of all is a kind of backwash from modern science. Actually, from the recent discoveries of astronomy, many people are literally mesmerized by mass. They have heard of the astonishing universe in which we live, of its measureless immensities and its uncountable constellations; and with a kind of natural kick-back, they begin to wonder of what possible interest they or their trivial concerns can be to the infinite mind of God. They have been led to regard themselves as a species of fly crawling on the ceiling of the universe, a little no-account life on one of the smallest and most insignificant planets in a solar system which itself is negligible. 'How can such a God have any interest in me?'—and if we cannot answer that, what place is there for the message of Christ, who preached God's care even for the sparrow?

I have found that it helps some people if we point out a rather foolish confusion of thought even in the making of such a comparison. It is only ludicrous to compare 'thought' and 'soul' with bulk or mass. All the dead or flaming stars in the universe cannot enter into any relevant comparison with the prayer of a soul or even the cry of an infant in the night. The two things are on different planes, and can have no understandable comparison of relative worth. Undoubtedly, our young people to-day are being bludgeoned by figures and doped by mass. Moreover, if it is not unreasonable to think of God as the 'perfect personal spirit,' why deny that claim implicitly by supposing that there are certain things beyond His interest or care? The Perfect Mind, if it is to be perfect, must be concerned even with a 'detail' like me. But that apart, it is in no

sense a diseased egoism that a thinking human soul, just because he is a thinking soul, should consider himself of infinitely more concern to the mind of God than a million dead stars!

7. Thus I consider that everything in our Christian faith has its foundation, in some final sense, on this thing we 'most certainly believe' and reasonably believe—the gracious and loving Fatherhood of God, the personal 'creative spirit.' It is here, for instance, that we can alone find any place for the so-called and much-criticised 'sanctions' for an authentic moral ideal. If we do believe in the Fatherhood of God, especially the full Fatherhood revealed to us in the mind of Jesus our Lord, we are reasonably led to believe that He has declared His will for us for all good ends. We believe that God has expressed His will in the mysterious universe in which we live, though we accept Dr. Eddington's cautious disclaimer that 'science does not indicate whether the world-spirit is good or evil.' But what science may not do, a reasonable faith may well do. We believe that law itself, as we see it in the world and in experience, is essentially and intentionally a *gracious* thing; it may hurt and punish, it may actually hurt and punish the innocent, but that does not in any sense deny its basal graciousness. But further, we are forced in reason to believe in a Will of God expressed everywhere: for, however dimly, *it is expressed in us* with our unavoidable judgments of right and wrong; and on any theory of ourselves, evolutionary or creative, that brings us back to some necessary notion of moral judgment somewhere. The end is always comprised in the beginning; and no matter how I account for myself, I am forced to believe that the moral dreams and longings which alone make me the peculiar thing we call 'man' must have some necessary place even in an evolutionary world.

8. Finally, it is the loving Fatherhood of God 'most certainly believed' which gives any sure place in our thinking for Jesus. More and more I come to believe that the God whom Jesus revealed, *i.e.* the *kind of God* He revealed, can alone justify any claim that Christ ever made for Himself. Jesus always explained Himself in terms of the Father's will—and so it is possible, in a strict sense, to say that it is not Jesus who explains God, but God, such a God and Father, who alone explains Jesus. To my own mind, no matter how I may be tempted to think about Christ, I can always feel inclined to assent to the most extravagant claim on His behalf, on one consideration—that I can believe in the full and perfect Fatherhood of God's heart! If I can



accept that, in the spiritual world that I feel this to be, there is nothing any longer that seems 'miraculous' to me. The miracle would be that such a God and Father should *not* reveal Himself, and should have no desire to have my love and

adoration. All our hope lies in our 'reasonable faith' that God is the Father of Jesus Christ. And the dilemma is—that such a Father alone explains Christ, and yet it is from Christ that we have any assurance of the heart of God.

## Literature.

### THE EPISTLES OF ST. PETER AND ST. JUDE.

HAS it yet been sufficiently recognized that modern commentaries are becoming so much more interesting than those of a generation ago? Certainly, a good illustration of this is supplied by the excellent commentary of the Archbishop of Brisbane, Dr. J. W. C. Wand, on *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* in the 'Westminster Commentaries' series (Methuen; 15s. net). This work supplies a want, long felt, but never completely met, since the publication of Canon Charles Bigg's learned commentary on these Epistles in the 'International Critical Commentary' series, for, while Dr. Wand's comments refer to the renderings of the Revised Version, they are obviously based on a close study of the Greek text, and can be followed with much advantage by readers who have the Greek before them.

The Commentary is notable for its full and able treatment of the problems of Introduction. Convincing arguments plainly show that 'Jude is the original writer upon whom 2 Peter relies,' and that the author of the later Epistle cannot be identified with the Apostle Peter. In the case of 1 Peter the Petrine authorship is affirmed. Dr. Wand closely examines Canon Streeter's suggestion ('The Primitive Church,' 115-33) that the Epistle consists of two writings, a sermon and a letter, written probably by Aristion of Smyrna about the year A.D. 90, but thinks that this theory goes much too far. He holds that 1<sup>3-4</sup> is part of a genuine letter, that 4<sup>12-5</sup> does not look in the least like a separate unit, and that the Address (1<sup>1</sup>) hits off exactly the tone and temper of the whole. A further contention of much interest is that the literary form of the Moral Codes in 2<sup>11-3</sup> and 5<sup>1-5</sup> 'stands between Colossians-Ephesians and the Pastorals.' After closely examining the External Evidence, the Question of Per-

secution, and the Doctrinal Character of the Epistle, he concludes that it was written by the Apostle Peter, with Silvanus as his amanuensis, in the closing years of Nero's reign.

Throughout, the comments on the text are full, suggestive, and always interesting. Dr. Wand has taken full account of the opinions of Bigg, Mayor, Wohlenberg, and especially of Windisch, the second edition of whose Commentary on the Catholic Epistles (1930) was recently issued in the well-known series bearing the title *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Among many passages furnished with illuminating comments 1 P 1<sup>23</sup> ('corruptible seed'), 2<sup>22-25</sup> (the Cross), 3<sup>18</sup> ('the righteous for the unrighteous'), and 2 P 1<sup>4</sup> ('partakers of the divine nature') stand out, and the same is true of the valuable discussion given to the phrase 'the spirits in prison' in 1 P 3<sup>19</sup> (cf. also 4<sup>6</sup>). The longer Notes call also for special mention, and in particular those on 'The Church and Slaves,' 'The Descent into Hell,' 'Deification,' as well as the long Excursus on the Origin of the Agape, in which Dr. Wand argues that the Agape came in from circles, probably Gnostic, outside the main stream of the Church's life. There can be no doubt at all that in his Commentary the Archbishop of Brisbane has made a rich and permanent contribution to Christian learning, and has thrown a flood of clear light on three Epistles in which the problems of Introduction and of exegesis are of longstanding difficulty.

### A MANUAL OF THEOLOGY.

*Christian Theology: The Doctrine of God* (Milford; 12s. 6d. net), by the Rt. Rev. A. C. Headlam, C.H., D.D., Bishop of Gloucester, is the outcome of the lectures which the author delivered to theological students, first as Professor of Dogmatic Theology at King's College, London, and then as Regius



Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. It is intended to be a manual of theology for those who desire to enter the Christian ministry in the Church of England. It does not profess to be a complete treatise on Christian theology, being limited in its scope to what it seemed to be important that the average student should know.

The only criticism we would make is a formal one. With a little more work on the MS the bibliographical references might easily have been made more consistently up-to-date. The lectures obviously bear the impress of last generation, but they may be none the worse of that. It is a little disappointing, however, to find on p. 14 an out-of-date footnote with references, although on p. 15 the references are to much more recent literature. And this sort of thing meets us in other parts of the volume.

The first part treats of the Source of Religious Knowledge. Here Dr. Headlam is content to employ the old distinction of natural religion and revealed religion, following up a semi-popular treatment of natural religion with chapters on the Bible and the Church. The whole is rounded off with a discussion of authority in religion.

The second part treats of the Doctrine of God. The doctrines of creation and redemption, the Christian Church, and the Christian hope are reserved for a subsequent volume.

From the standpoint that the belief in God is the hypothesis which best explains the facts of experience, Dr. Headlam considers the traditional arguments for the Divine existence, and proceeds to consider various rival forms of belief and other questions relevant to theistic apology. An attempt is then made to relate the theistic position to modern thought in the spheres of science and philosophy. It is his conviction that the Christian conception of God as Almighty, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, is not only essential for religion, but the most rational explanation of the universe.

In the chapters that follow, the Christian conception of God is further developed. Indeed the discussion now resolves itself into an elaborate, useful, and masterly presentation of Christology, mainly historical. Then comes an exposition of the theology of the Holy Spirit, and of the doctrine of the Trinity.

We hope that Dr. Headlam will publish the second part of his lectures on Christian Dogmatics; for the whole work would be an excellent equipment of the theological student for his future task of preaching and teaching. The average student should have no difficulty in grasping Dr. Headlam's meaning.

## THE ATONEMENT.

In issuing in book form the series of Dale Lectures on *The Atonement* which he delivered at Mansfield College, Oxford, last year (Milford; 6s. net), Principal R. S. Franks has added a most interesting preface, which those readers who habitually skip prefaces are advised not to miss. In it he traces the development of his own theological thinking. For long he was a contented Ritschlian. But one of Troeltsch's works made him dissatisfied with the Ritschlian separation of theology and metaphysics. Troeltsch also introduced him to 'the great, but forgotten, speculative theologian, C. H. Weisse.' Weisse and, later, Karl Heim referred him back to the great medieval theologians, especially to Alexander of Hales, 'the true progenitor of the type of theology for which I stand.'

So what Dr. Franks sets out to do in this series of lectures is to provide an adequate metaphysical basis for the experiential doctrine of the Atonement always associated with the name of its great proponent, Abelard. He is persuaded that this theory goes to the very heart of the matter. If it has seemed to many, not indeed wrong—for it is obviously true so far as it goes—but inadequate, that is because it has not been fitted into a comprehensive and satisfactory metaphysic of Christianity. It adds to the interest of his book that for guidance as to the method to be used in doing this Dr. Franks goes to that great champion of a very different theory of the Atonement, Anselm, whose well-forged weapons are used against himself.

For Anselm the task of theology was the reconciliation of authority and reason. Later medieval theologians tended more and more to base theology upon authority alone, until William of Ockham denied that there could be any rational understanding at all of the individual doctrines revealed by authority. Calvin took essentially the same position, and so do the Barthians to-day. Dr. Franks holds that Anselm was right, and consequently regards the Barthian theology as altogether unsatisfactory. Probably most of his readers will agree with him. But authority and reason are opposites which cannot possibly be reconciled, and authority which is subject to the criticism of reason is not properly authority at all. The real question is whether there is in Christianity anything which can be called authority in the strict sense. On the other hand, revelation and reason do not need to be reconciled, for revelation is given through reason.

Working from the side of reason, Anselm held



that the existence of God could be proved by the ontological argument. Dr. Franks agrees; only the change in the philosophical situation brought about by the development of natural science requires that the argument should now be stated in a more articulated form. Strangely enough, this has really been done, Dr. Franks holds, by two thinkers who formally rejected the argument, St. Thomas Aquinas and Kant. In the Kantian form the argument is valid and it is the basis of modern Christian theology. It leads to the conclusion that there is a Good Will at the heart of things. Since happiness is a necessary part of the highest good of a rational finite being, this Good Will must be concerned, not only for the moral virtue, but also for the happiness, of men. So it is exactly what we mean by love. God is, and God is Love.

But though we may reach this conclusion by reason alone, that does not save us. An argument, however convincing, has no power to soften and melt the hardest thing in the world, the impenitent heart of man. For that a revelation of the Divine Love is necessary. So in the life, and still more in the death, of Christ that love becomes concrete, becomes incarnate. The value of the sufferings of Christ is not purificatory, or expiatory, or satisfactory: it is revelatory. The revelation suffices for our salvation; it moves us to accept the love which we had rejected—and that is forgiveness, and to imitate it—and that is grace.

Such, in briefest outline, is Dr. Franks' constructive argument; with the historical and critical part of the book, which is perhaps less important, though not less interesting, we have no space to deal. Both in its criticism and in its construction this admirable little book is lucid and persuasive. It will be of real help to many who would like to accept the Abelardian doctrine of the Atonement but have had uneasy doubts about its sufficiency and adequacy.

### THE FORM-HISTORY OF THE GOSPELS.

*From Tradition to Gospel* (Nicholson & Watson; 8s. 6d. net), by Martin Dibelius, Ph.D., D.Th., Professor of New Testament in Heidelberg, is a translation of the revised second edition, 1933 (the first edition appeared in 1919) of the author's *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. The translation has been made by Dr. Bertram Lee Woolf, of the New Testament Chair at Hackney and New College, University of London, who prefixes a brief biographical note on Dr. Dibelius.

The aim of *Formgeschichte* (the word is said

to be a coinage of Dr. Dibelius) is twofold. In the first place, it seeks to explain the origin of the tradition about Jesus; and, in the second place, it seeks to show the intention and real interest of the tradition. It shows, according to Dr. Dibelius, how the earliest testimony about Jesus was interwoven with the earliest testimony about the salvation which had appeared in Jesus Christ.

If we are to reach the literary understanding of the Synoptic Gospels, we should begin—it is urged—with the recognition that they are collections of material. The Evangelists are principally collectors or vehicles of tradition. Although St. Luke is an author in the Acts of the Apostles, in the Third Gospel he is only a collector and editor, being there much more bound by his material.

From this we may conclude that the form in which the words and deeds of Jesus are presented to us is due only in a certain degree to the personal agency of the Evangelist. For the Evangelists took over material which already had a form of its own. Even the small separate pieces which the Evangelists joined together obey the laws of Form-construction. And to trace out those laws is to write the Form-history of the Gospel. Accordingly, the problem of Form-history ultimately resolves itself into a study of the life and interests of the people who constituted the earliest Christian community.

They were an unliterary people, and their consuming interest was religious. And their religion was characteristically expressed through the medium of the sermon. The sermon was a Form-giving principle, and, accordingly, the elements of the Gospel tradition immediately connected with Christian preaching are worthy of careful consideration.

Dr. Dibelius examines successively the paradigms or short illustrative stories of an event, the tales or stories told primarily for their own sake, and the legends or narratives about some sainted person. The Passion story, with its relative self-sufficiency, also provides an important clue to Form-history. A study of the synthesis in Mark raises the question of the words of Jesus, a third feature which Mark included in his book along with paradigms and tales.

The foundation of the Gospel tradition being laid in preaching, it follows that the story of Jesus is not of mythological origin; the oldest witnesses to Christian preaching, which are the paradigms, make no reference to a mythological hero. Indeed, the general development of primitive Christianity is from an historical person to his formal worship, and



finally to ecclesiastical Christology. It is a development to which the Gospel forms bear clear witness.

For the rest, the standpoint of *Formgeschichte* is able through its citation of the oldest witnesses to show the unworldly character of the original tradition. It shows also how the tradition gradually accommodated itself to the world by developing the tale and the legend, and by providing a framework through which it assumed to itself the character of literature.

We are indebted to Professor Woolf for giving us this timely translation. The second edition of the *Formgeschichte* marks indeed the end of the first stage and the beginning of the second stage of a promising discussion.

### THE ACCURACY OF THE BIBLE.

Dr. Yahuda is well known for his Semitic scholarship, having occupied the Chairs of Biblical History in Berlin University and of Semitic Languages in the University of Madrid. He has given us another excellent volume, *The Accuracy of the Bible* (Heinemann; 10s. 6d. net), intended chiefly for the general public interested in Biblical problems. The object of the volume is to show the affinity of the early Biblical narratives with the Egyptian language, manners, and customs, and thus answer those scholars who have assumed that the earliest books of the Bible were not written till long after the events described in them. In particular, the Joseph narrative, the account of the Exodus, the stories of Genesis, and other parts of the Bible are proved to be largely dependent on the influence of contemporary Egyptian culture. The Hebrew-Egyptian relationship has been well discussed before, but Dr. Yahuda here considers it from a wider and broader angle than has been done hitherto, and considers it as far more discernible in the Pentateuch than Egyptologists have so far admitted. At the same time, he disclaims any one-sided pan-Egyptian standpoint, and seeks to treat the subject with breadth of view and caution by not neglecting the Assyro-Babylonian and other elements. The whole argument leads up to a demonstration of the antiquity and authenticity of the Biblical writings. It is shown that these, on account of their form, style, linguistic garb, and peculiar colouring, could only have developed in the course of the migrations of the Hebrews through Canaan to Egypt, and back again. In an excellent chapter on the date of the Exodus, the two opposing theories, the one upholding 1445 B.C. and the other 1220 B.C., are ably discussed, and the former date is accepted as the

authentic one and the Biblical chronology based on this is adopted.

The book is a worthy successor to Dr. Yahuda's last one ('The Language of the Pentateuch in its Relation to Egyptian'). It could only have been written by one who is a thorough master of the material, and especially one who has an intimate knowledge of Hebrew and Egyptian language and customs. Not all critics will agree with the placing of the Garden of Eden and the Biblical Flood in the land of Egypt, but the reasons advanced are worthy of consideration. We welcome the volume, which has an Appendix of Notes and is beautifully illustrated. It is sure to take a front place in every Biblical archæologist's library.

### PALESTINE AND ISRAEL.

Two excellent little books have just appeared from the pen of Sir Flinders Petrie, the well-known Egyptologist. In the one—*Palestine and Israel* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net)—he has given us some historical notes of Palestine in relation to the Biblical records. Starting with the state of the country before Abram, and going on to the end of the monarchy, he identifies and describes the various peoples (Canaanites, Amorites, Hittites, etc.), discusses the family history of the patriarchs, explains numerous difficulties in Biblical interpretation, and deals with the date and route of the Exodus. He rejects the JEDP theory, which he believes rests on a fallacy. He adopts the late chronology, putting Abram's birth in 1830 B.C., and the entry of the Israelites into Canaan in 1186 B.C. (instead of 1400, as Garstang and others do). One of the reasons advanced against the early entry, namely, that Jabin in his war against the Israelites had nine hundred chariots of iron, whereas this metal was not in use by that time, will hardly convince all readers, for Jabin's opposition does not seem to have occurred till about two hundred years after the entry (cf. Jg 4<sup>1-4</sup>), probably when Zebulun and Naphtali left their homes in the central hill country and migrated northward; and we know also that iron mines were worked at Kara Eyuk, in Asia Minor, almost a thousand years before this. The book, which contains fifty-three illustrations, of which fifteen are plates, is of prime importance to the Old Testament student. Coming, as it does, from a great Egyptologist, it serves as an excellent archæological commentary on Israelite history.

In the other little book by Sir Flinders—*Measures and Weights* (Methuen; 2s. net)—we have a most



interesting and enlightening study of the various lineal measures, capacity measures, and weights used in ancient times. The value of such a study is that it forms a basis for discovering the movements of civilization and the trade connexions between the various countries. 'Weights,' says Sir Flinders, 'enable us to put a finger on the pulse of man's activities in each country in ages long past.' The booklet, which is clearly written, concise, and thoroughly trustworthy, deserves a place in the library of every one interested in the Ancient East.

---

### JAMES YOUNG SIMPSON.

*The Garment of the Living God* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 6s. net) is a posthumous work of the late Professor J. Y. Simpson, M.A., D.Sc., D.Jur., F.R.S.E., edited by his widow and introduced by a memoir from the pen of Dr. Freeland Barbour. The book is not, as so many posthumous publications are, a collection of detached essays, but a considered deliverance on the relations of science and religion, the subject of all others that constantly occupied the writer's mind. He had been invited to deliver the 'Sprunt Lectures' at Richmond Theological Seminary in 1934, and these chapters are the result, a carefully prepared statement on an urgent and timely subject. The particular topics dealt with are such as these: The Present-Day Interactions of Scientific and Religious Thought, Does Science leave Room for God?, Evolution and Ethics, and The Unchanging Christ.

These lectures may be strongly commended on their merits, for Dr. Simpson was a sincere and strenuous thinker, a real scientist both in knowledge and outlook, and he was at the same time a deeply religious soul, with a religion that was broad and at the same time loyal to the central verities. But many will be glad to possess this volume because of the admirable memoir written with both knowledge and affection by Dr. Barbour. Professor Simpson was a singularly charming personality. His interests were varied and his services both to the nation and the Church ranged over a wide field. And he was one of that very select company to whom the term 'saint' might without much exaggeration be applied. On all these grounds this is a book that will be widely valued.

---

### DR. FOSDICK'S SERMONS.

Dr. Fosdick says, in the Foreword to his second volume of sermons—*The Secret of Victorious Living*

(S.C.M. ; 6s. net)—that he has been unwilling to publish his sermons. It has been the popularity of the first volume that has extracted a second. His unwillingness is surprising, in view of the fact that his sermons differ very little from any of his other published works. There is no text at the head of the sermon. The text emerges as we go on reading. In point of fact this is topical preaching, but it is topical preaching at its best. There is no mere clever handling of up-to-date themes. The subjects are just the things the ordinary educated man thinks about, when he thinks about religion or life at all. We may all find our difficulties faced in these sermons, and most of our questions, and if the answers are not always satisfying they are always honest and thoughtful.

Dr. Fosdick is a Modernist, but not a barren Modernist. The great defect of modern Liberalism has been its lack of a positive gospel. That is the real source of Fundamentalism. The Fundamentalist finds Liberalism barren, because with the old narrow traditionalism it has thrown away the gospel of grace. Dr. Fosdick has not yielded to that fatal temptation. His sermons are constructive. He has a message, and in essentials it is the 'old, old story.' That is one quality of these sermons. But in addition it must be said that they are delightful reading. The intellectual sincerity, the insight into life, the direct handling of life's perplexities make this book very attractive, and will suggest to preachers many an edifying subject.

---

*A New Highway towards Christian Reality* (Allen & Unwin ; 8s. 6d. net) is described by its author, Mr. T. Wigley, M.A., as a book intended 'for the thoughtful men and women who desire to bring their religious beliefs and expressions into line with the newer ideas in science and philosophy.' This praiseworthy effort is followed through twelve chapters in which Mr. Wigley discusses Nature, Law, Man, God, Jesus, Immanence, Miracle, Sin, Personal Survival, and other important topics. The author writes with knowledge, and supplies a number—indeed, a superabundance—of very useful quotations. Unfortunately he is inclined to saddle Orthodoxy with obsolete views, and he abandons so much that little is left as forming the essence of Christianity, beyond the idea of the Immanence of God expressed in Jesus Christ and a plea for a conception of religion which makes for the moral, social, and physical blessing of humanity.



The best chapter in the book treats the question of Personal Survival.

There are those, like Sir John Marshall, who hold that Saivism is 'the most ancient living faith in the world,' that there is sound archaeological evidence of its existence in the Indus valley dating back for not less than five thousand years. And still to-day it is the most popular of the three main groups of religions which found on the Vedas, in addition to their own particular Scriptures. Here is a clear cut and lucid account of what it means and is to a convinced modern adherent—*The Saiva School of Hinduism*, by Principal S. Shivapadasundaram, B.A. (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). It is apparently not written to convert, but merely to inform. For, says the author, 'proselytizing must cease. The public must regard it as a crime against humanity and the State and society must punish it.' And, indeed, this dreary philosophy, this apathetic God, this hopeless-looking quest has not much to offer. Yet, to know what it is—much modernized, and with its ugly features left discreetly out of sight—this is a useful book.

The main value of *The United Free Church of Scotland* (Allenson; 6s. net) lies, if we mistake not, in its expression of the merits and foibles of its author, Rev. J. Barr, B.D. Those who know him and esteem him, and they are many, will find in this lengthy book just the qualities of the man. It touches on many subjects; it taketh up the centuries as a very little thing; it is in some parts very one-sided; it is breezy and stimulating even in its very perversities; it leaves the reader with no sense of indignation but rather with the regret that a man of real ability who knows so much should have learned so little. Objectively the work will be found useful for its presentation of relevant and significant extracts from Assembly speeches and newspaper articles bearing on the negotiations which preceded the union of the churches. The future historian will find such useful and be grateful for them.

The Cambridge University Press has made possible an important contribution to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament by publishing *The Text of Acts in Codex 614* (Tisch. 137) and its Allies (6s. net), edited by the late Mr. A. V. Valentine-Richards, M.A., formerly Fellow, Dean, and Theological Lecturer of Christ's College, Cambridge. A useful Introduction is supplied by Professor J. M. Creed. 614 is the most outstanding representative

of a group of minuscule MSS which give a text of the Acts which contains a considerable proportion of 'Western' additions. 'For those portions of Acts,' says Dr. Creed, 'where Codex Bezae is defective, 614 becomes an authority of the first importance, and in reconstructing the "Western" text its evidence can never be safely neglected.' Besides recording variant readings in the Textus Receptus, the apparatus criticus gives the readings of part or the whole of 383 (Act 58, Old Notation), 431 (Act 180), and 1518 (Act 216). The provenance of the archetype of 614 and its allies is conjectural, but Dr. Creed suggests that the close affinities between 614 and the 'Harclean' Syriac 'make it natural to look in the direction of the Syrian Monophysitism.'

Sir James Jeans' latest book, *Through Space and Time* (Cambridge University Press; 8s. 6d. net), is very happily introduced to the reader by a fine photograph on the cover, of the author demonstrating in the middle of a throng of deeply interested boys and girls, with some grave elders in the background. The book is 'based on the Royal Institution Lectures, Christmas 1933.' These lectures, which have been given annually for over a century, are defined as 'adapted to a juvenile auditory.' 'In practice,' Sir James Jeans remarks, 'this rather quaint phrase means that the lecturer will be confronted with an eager and critical audience, ranging in respect of age from under eight to over eighty, and in respect of scientific knowledge from the aforesaid child of under eight to staid professors of science and venerable Fellows of the Royal Society, each of whom will expect the lecturer to say something that will interest him.' For such a task no fitter choice could have been made, and the lecturer has given of his best. In eight successive lectures he treats of the earth, the air, the sky, the moon, the planets, the sun, the stars, and the nebulae. It will be understood that there is nothing here that may not be found in the lecturer's larger works, but to many readers this smaller book will provide just the amount of information which they desire and are able without effort to take in. One wonders, however, if a popular book of this sort, which after all contains only two hundred pages, could not have been published at a cheaper rate.

Dr. James Black has prepared a revised edition of *The Mystery of Preaching*, and it has been published in cheaper form by Messrs. James Clarke & Co. (3s. 6d. net). It will be remembered that this volume contains the Warwick Lectures delivered

in 1923. Two of the closing chapters in the original editions are omitted in the present one. We are glad to see that a new edition has been called for.

We cordially recommend *I Believe*, by the Rev. John Foster, B.A. (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). Of all the recent attempts to make the essentials of the Faith intelligible to the modern mind, this one, all brief as it is, strikes us as one of the best. Undoubtedly, one reason for this is that the author has been, as a teacher in Union Theological College, Canton, compelled to study and to practise the presentation of Christian truth to minds to which the teaching comes as something new. We can imagine nothing better than this pregnant, thoughtful, and persuasive book for use in classes for preparation for Confirmation or first Communion. Any one perplexed as to the meaning of the Church's Creed will be greatly helped.

*Common Misquotations* is a fascinating little book. In it Mr. Hesketh Pearson has gathered all the familiar misquotations he could find—giving in each case the original and the misquotation. He omits from the corrections phrases in works of early authors which have been changed by later authors—often improved on, but there is an interesting discussion about some of these in the long introduction, in which he tells us, for example, that 'Chaucer's

"But all thing which that shineth as the gold  
Ne is no gold as I have herd it told"

becomes "Gold all is not that doth golden seem" in Spenser, then "All that glisters is not gold" in Shakespeare, then "All is not gold that glisteneth" in Middleton; finally reaching in Dryden the phrase we now quote: "All . . . that glitters is not gold."

We predict that many of the misquotations will be hotly argued over. Do you agree with Mr. Pearson that Gray's 'Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife' is familiarly misquoted 'Far from the *maddening* crowd'? The publisher is Hamish Hamilton, and the price is 2s. 6d. net.

The title of Dr. John A. Hutton's latest book, *Finally* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), has a somewhat ominous sound about it. One would hope it is not intended as a hint that nothing further is to be expected from his pen. We should deeply deplore that, for Dr. Hutton writes as freshly

as ever out of the abundance of a mature mind. The title is suggested by the text in Philippians where St. Paul in closing his Epistle exhorts his readers to think on all that is pure and true and good. This text Dr. Hutton chooses as being what one might say who had permission to speak only one final word of counsel. It is certainly a fitting word for our time when so many—and these Dr. Hutton obviously has in view—are ready to overturn the very foundations of the moral life. But Dr. Hutton does not come to his text at once. It is his manner to wind his way into the heart of his subject, sometimes by a route that seems unduly circuitous. Still, he is so pleasant a companion, so informative and stimulating, with so much of interest to point out by the way, that frankly we do not care what route he follows, so long as we are in his company. In this case he approaches his subject through a study of the spiritual life of St. Paul. This is manifestly the work of one who has lived with Paul, has entered deeply into his mind, and has studied his experiences in the light of a powerful and sanctified imagination. Writing of this sort is a moral tonic; it searches, strengthens, and elevates the soul of the reader. Like the sea and the mountains it communicates a solemn sense of the greatness of life.

The Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead has made a name for himself as a popular exponent of psychology in its relation to physical and spiritual health. In his latest book, *Psychology and Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), he has given a most interesting and helpful survey of the whole field, with a wealth of illustrations principally drawn from his own clinic. In his exposition of psychology there is nothing new—probably he would not claim that there is—but he has been highly successful in treating the subject without technicalities and in such a way as to capture and hold the general reader. There are statements here and there which one would be disposed gravely to question. But the book abounds in excellent counsels. A very proper warning is given against the popular slogan, 'Don't repress,' which may so easily lead to a doctrine of unchartered licence. Repression as understood in psychology is an unconscious act, and quite different from deliberate or voluntary suppression of desire. Another useful warning is that psycho-analysis is not lightly to be undergone, but should be regarded in the same way as a major surgical operation. Perhaps the chief excellence of Mr. Weatherhead's book lies in the persuasive way in which he brings out the harmony of much of the new



psychology with the teachings of the gospel, and shows the value of Christian faith for physical and spiritual health.

It is excellent to know that a third edition of *The Vision of God*, by Professor Kenneth E. Kirk, has been required. The present edition is abridged, and this has been done chiefly through the omission of footnotes and the omission of Additional Notes. This edition should bring Professor Kirk's Bampton Lectures within the reach of a much wider public (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net).

*Inquiry into the Unknown*, edited by Mr. Theodore Besterman (Methuen; 3s. 6d. net), is a B.B.C. symposium on the subject of Psychical Research, and contains the talks given by Gerald Heard, Lord Charles Hope, Professor Seligman, Professor Broad, Sir Oliver Lodge, and two women, Mrs. Salter and Dame Edith Lyttelton. The subjects dealt with are mediumship, telepathy, ghosts, foreknowledge, and survival. The talks created great and widespread interest when they were given, and will doubtless sustain and increase that interest in their published form. To be frank, the book is not very impressive. There are too many generalities, and not enough evidence. But, whether we agree or not with the positions here maintained, the free ventilation of these matters is all to the good. And it would be foolish to close our minds against what may well one day be convincingly demonstrated. Sir Oliver Lodge maintains that that day has already arrived.

A pathetic interest attaches to *Stories of the Holy Fathers*, by Sir Ernest A. Wallis Budge (Milford; 10s. 6d. net), inasmuch as it came into our hands a short time before the news of the distinguished author's death. The work is a re-issue in different format of the first volume of 'The Paradise of the Fathers,' which was published in 1907.

In his new work, *Mediaeval Legends of Christ* (Nicholson & Watson; 10s. 6d. net), Dr. A. S. Rappoport has performed a useful service in bringing together a collection of mediaeval legends connected with the earthly life of Christ, and drawn from the Apocryphal Gospels, the *Legenda Aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine, and other sources, including Miracle Plays and publications of the Early English Text Society. In a somewhat brief Introduction, Dr. Rappoport maintains that, whereas a myth implies the personification of abstract forces or ideas, a legend 'usually has an historical or topo-

graphical basis,' and that it is 'a valuable document as far as the religious psychology of the people, of the humble and unsophisticated, is concerned.' He also supplies an account of the motives which appear in Christian legends, of the various interests which have gone to shape them, and of the influence they have exerted upon Art. The substance of the book supplies the legends themselves. In reading them one has sympathy with the opinion of Harnack which the author quotes, that legend is the 'creeper of history' and its 'worst enemy.' At the same time Dr. Rappoport has good reason to claim that legends are valuable because 'they contain the people's religious philosophy of history.'

*Our National Church* (Nisbet; 6s. net), by the Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D., Canon of Westminster, is designed to prepare the way for the reception of the Report of the Commission set up in England five years ago to inquire into the relations between Church and State. Dr. Dearmer is of opinion that our increasingly religious, if increasingly undogmatic, world is looking for some ideal system 'which shall be above all sectional peculiarities, untrammelled by outgrown ideas, and able to unite all good men in ordered liberty and active fellowship around the person of Christ.' He himself would look to National Churches as making possible the upbuilding of such a system, and he has great faith in the part which the Church of England and the Anglican Churches generally might take in this great work. In this volume will be found a good account of present conditions and tendencies in the Church of England, with special reference to doctrine, worship, government, and the problem of Christian unity. 'We talk of the unity of Christendom, and immerse ourselves in adjustments. But it is really the charity of Christendom that we seek. Unity will come almost as an incident, because it will be inevitable when there is goodwill.' This sentence is characteristic of the book as a whole. It is a book which should commend itself to the bishops of the Church of England, for it is in great part a commentary upon the Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1930.

A volume of Christian Socialist sermons has been published by the Reverend J. H. Howard, Minister of St. Catherine's Presbyterian Church, Liverpool (Principality Press, Wrexham; 4s. net), with the title *Jesus the Agitator*. Mr. George Lansbury has written the Foreword. The thought running through the volume is summed up in T. R. Glover's sentence, 'The Christian proclaimed a war

of religion in which there shall be no compromise and no peace till Christ is Lord of all: the thing shall be fought out to the bitter end.'

Twenty years ago Professor A. C. McGiffert was widely known in this country as well as in America as an outstanding liberal in theology. He was a prolific writer, particularly on the history of Christianity, a scientific scholar, and a pronounced influence on the religious thought of his own land. His death occurred in February 1933, and now his son has issued, as a work of piety and affection, a volume of studies under the title *Christianity as History and Faith* (Scribner's; 7s. 6d. net). He has been able to secure a certain unity in the series, largely because this unity existed in his father's own work. The first section is strictly historical, dealing with the main types of Christian thought. We are particularly glad to have the second section which represents Dr. McGiffert's personal religion, a matter he seldom revealed in his historical studies. This part is very rich and varied, and covers the whole ground, dealing with the personal application of Christian faith both in individual experience and social implications. We have summarized in the 'Notes of Recent Exposition' one of these chapters as a typical representation of his applied religious faith. But the whole volume will receive a cordial welcome by scholars among ourselves as a worthy memorial of a great Christian scholar.

Many will be glad to have proof that at a time when there has been so much talk about the revival of 'catholic' principles, at least one strong voice from within the Anglican Communion can be raised in commendation of liberal evangelicalism. It is that of the Archdeacon of Westminster, the Rev. Vernon F. Storr, M.A., who has written *Spiritual Liberty: A Study of Liberal Evangelicalism* (S.C.M.; 4s. net). Its nine chapters deal with the essence of evangelicalism, the early evangelicals, liberty and authority, the Bible, the Church, worship, the re-discovery of the New Testament, and the future of liberal evangelicalism. Every topic is handled with that ease of treatment which arises when a sober judgment has been instructed by wide reading and adequate reflection. We wish for the book a very wide circulation both inside and outside the Church of which the author is so distinguished an ornament, and so loyal a servant.

In June 1934 the Chancellor of the University of London unveiled a bust to the memory of Ronald Ross. And in that month, too, the union of the

Ross Institute with the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine took place, a union designed to forward their great purpose, the conquest of the pestilences of the world. So it is timely that Mr. J. O. Dobson should have written, and the S.C.M. have published, a short account of *Ronald Ross*, and of his great discovery of how the mosquito propagates malaria. The price of the book is 3s. 6d. net.

Dr. F. C. Grant who is one of the Editors of the 'Anglican Theological Review' and Dean of the Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois, has placed many New Testament students under his debt by translating two important pamphlets on Form-Criticism which have been written by distinguished German scholars. The title is *Form-Criticism* (Willett, Clark & Co., New York; \$2.00). Of the essays the first is R. Bultmann's *Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien* (2nd ed., 1930) and the second K. Kundsins's *Das Urchristentum im Lichte der Evangelienforschung*. The aim of the essays is to pass behind the written Gospels to an investigation of the earliest oral tradition. Suggestive in treatment, they are radical in character, and it would in some ways have been an advantage if Dr. Grant had also translated L. Koehler's essay, 'Das formgeschichtliche Problem des N.T.' We must be grateful, however, for what we have actually received, and especially for translations which, while aiming at a close rendering, are at the same time presented in good English.

When a man sets out to give within the compass of a hundred pages an account of all the great religions of the world, including Christianity, and to show their place and influence in the great evolutionary process, he is really essaying an impossible task. In *The Growth of Religious Thought*, by Mr. W. Campbell Brown, M.A. (Lincoln Williams; 2s. 6d. net), this task is attempted, and with a wonderful degree of success, all things being considered. The conclusion reached, however, is somewhat tame. The presentation of Christianity is of the humanistic type, and tends to leave the impression that Christ is merely the greatest of religious teachers, and that through human effort in following Him the Kingdom of God will come.

*Herbert Spencer's Sociology, with a Bibliography of Spencer and his Work*, by Mr. J. Rumney, Ph.D. (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net), is a very admirable performance. It does justice to the part



played by Spencer as the pioneer of a new science ; it indicates what is of abiding value in the methods and presuppositions which guided Spencer, in what respects his views have had to be modified, and what is the present position of Sociology. For all

students of that rather elusive but profoundly interesting science we should regard this able work, to which Professor Morris Ginsburg writes a commendatory preface, as useful in the highest degree, even indispensable.

## Some Outstanding New Testament Problems.

### IV. Jesus and the Kingdom of God.

BY THE REVEREND R. NEWTON FLEW, D.D., WESLEY HOUSE, CAMBRIDGE.

THE central theme of the preaching of Jesus was the Kingdom of God, and the debate as to the meaning of the phrase is not yet closed. Perhaps the subject will ultimately be found to be inexhaustible, because 'the Galilean is still too great for our small hearts.' But it seems that a new chapter in the volume of New Testament scholarship has been opened by some recent studies. To understand their significance we must go back to two previous periods in the long debate. The name of honour in the first period is that of Albrecht Ritschl (1822-89), and in the second, that of Johannes Weiss (died 1914).

(1) The Kingdom of God was a regulative principle in the theology of Ritschl, who understood the phrase to mean 'the organisation of humanity through action inspired by love.' The conception was accepted by Ritschl's followers. Herrmann regarded the Kingdom as 'the universal moral community, the aspect under which humanity is included in God's purpose for Himself.' According to Kaftan in his earlier work, Jesus preached the Kingdom of God 'as our highest good and as our supreme ideal.' Through various channels the view that the Kingdom was a community of human beings reached the preaching of this country. Professor A. B. Bruce declared that 'no higher idea can be formed of salvation than to make it consist in citizenship in the divine commonwealth.' The Roman Catholic identifies the Kingdom on earth with the Church. A similar interpretation is placed on some passages in the New Testament by Protestant scholars to-day. Thus Professor Kirsopp Lake in his great commentary (pp. 4, 91, 239, 261) says that in all the passages in the Acts the Kingdom may be interpreted in its 'later' sense as the Church. The interpretation of the

Kingdom as primarily a community is evidently still influential and pervasive.

Two considerations should make us pause. Where is the proof from the Old Testament to support such a view? The Hebraists tell us another story. And where is the proof that the earliest readers of the New Testament identified the Kingdom with the Church? With the doubtful exception of a sentence in St. Augustine, there are no passages in the Fathers of the first four centuries where the identification is certainly made. Usually in the Fathers the Kingdom is regarded as future ; in Clement of Alexandria and Origen it is also inward and spiritual. Even in St. Ambrose the definition of the Kingdom as a society is not to be found. Patristic interpretations may not be sufficient to decide a disputed point of exegesis, but when we read of the 'later' conception of the Kingdom as meaning 'the Church' it is surely significant that the conception is very late indeed.

(2) The second period was inaugurated by Johannes Weiss in 1892. His slender book of sixty-seven pages had, in fact, been preceded by the independent study of Schmoller (Leiden, 1891), who recognized that the Kingdom in many passages is to be interpreted eschatologically. But Schweitzer's estimate of the work of Weiss is justified : 'it closes one epoch and begins another.' To deny the predominance of eschatology in the teaching of our Lord was thereafter impossible.

Johannes Weiss was perhaps the greatest New Testament exegete of our time. Though his chief works have never been translated into English, they have been influential beyond the work of his admirer, the famous Albert Schweitzer. The controversy evoked by *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* led to the publication of many books in

England, but few scholars have followed Schweitzer in maintaining that for Jesus the Kingdom was wholly in the future, and was not present in any sense save that it casts a shadow on the earth like a cloud, and so 'its nearness is recognized by the paralysis of the kingdom of Satan.' In his last and most brilliant article on our subject, Johannes Weiss himself<sup>1</sup> admitted that in many sayings 'the Kingdom' could not be interpreted in a purely eschatological sense. 'The problem of the relation of the eschatological to the non-eschatological sayings of Jesus has not yet been solved.'

(3) The problem thus left unsolved is inescapable. The consequences for the Christology of the Church are far-reaching. It is no solution to strike out awkward sayings like Mk 8<sup>38-9</sup><sup>1</sup>, after the manner of C. W. Emmet in *The Lord of Thought*, or, like von Dobschütz (*The Eschatology of the Gospels*, 1910), to leave them unreconciled and unexplained, side by side with the other sayings which speak of the Kingdom as present, and to say bluntly that these non-eschatological sayings alone have permanent value and are to be put in the first rank.

In two contributions which lie together in the *Harnack-Festgabe* (1921), we may trace the dawn of a better day. The Ritschlian Kaftan, in a statement of the Problem of New Testament Theology, admits (p. 141) that he has been forced to the conclusion that the expectation of the speedy end of the age is the necessary point of departure for the new journey. He states this 'expectation' in stronger terms: 'The early Christians were convinced that they were living amid the accomplishment of the Last Things,' 'The answer to the problem is to be found in one name—Jesus Christ' (p. 142). In the next article Kattenbusch investigates the point of origin of the Idea of the Church (*Der Quellort der Kirchenidee*), and finds it in apocalyptic, in Dn 7. The English reader may be recommended to a careful study of the results of a Conference of German and English theologians at Canterbury in April 1927. The papers appeared in *Theology*, May 1927. For the purpose of this article those of C. H. Dodd, G. Kittel, K. L. Schmidt, and A. E. J. Rawlinson are especially significant. Then followed a large and valuable work by Gerhard Gloege, *Reich Gottes und Kirche* (Gütersloh, 1929), where a full bibliography is to be found, and a new solution propounded. H. D. Wendland (*Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes*, Gütersloh, 1931) agrees with the chief positions of Gloege. The most valuable recent studies in English are Dr. John

Oman's article in *The Churchman* (July 1932), on 'The Permanent Value of Apocalyptic,' which reappears as a contribution to the Jewish-Christian symposium, *In Spirit and in Truth* (ed. G. A. Yates, 1934); and E. F. Scott's book, *The Kingdom of God* (1931). The magnificent work of Rudolf Otto, *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn* (1934), deserves more than one article to itself. A careful résumé of its contents is given by Dr. Sydney Cave in the *Congregational Quarterly*, October 1934.

We shall best trace the advance made in an understanding of the Kingdom by reference to Gloege, and the even more valuable articles of Karl Ludwig Schmidt.

Gloege's endeavour is, first, to win a fresh understanding of the phrase, Kingdom of God, in the light of the Hebraic conception of God, which Jesus shared; second, to make plain the meaning of the New Testament conception of the *Ecclesia*, and define its relation to the conception of the Kingdom. The two conceptions are closely related in the New Testament. I may summarize the conclusions reached. *Basileia* is the Kingly Rule (or activity) of God Himself, while *Ecclesia* is the new People of God, the community of those who come under the yoke of that Kingly Rule. Hence the *Ecclesia* consists of those who are ruled, those under the Rule; it ought never to be identified with the Rule itself. Such an identification confuses the parts played by God and man.

I. THE 'KINGDOM.'—Gloege has undertaken the necessary lexicographical labour. His results agree in the main with those of Dalman, whose work (*The Words of Jesus*, 1902, pp. 91-146) is available for English readers, though Gloege, I think rightly, rejects any local or 'static' interpretation of *Basileia* as 'realm' or 'renovated world.' More recently, in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch* (1933) Karl Ludwig Schmidt and others have given us masterly articles with the philological evidence necessary to establish the meaning of the Kingdom of God as the Kingly Rule of God, the Sovereignty of God.

The first characteristic of the Hebraic conception of God is that He is always Active Will. We need not follow Gloege in the modern terms, 'Dynamik,' and the like, which he uses to describe this Biblical conception. But it is true that in the Gospels the Rule of God comes 'with power' (ἐν δυνάμει, Mk 9<sup>1</sup>; cf. 1 Co 4<sup>20</sup>). It is likened to some one *doing* something, to a sower who sows seed with vital force in it, to a woman baking bread by means of leaven with transforming power in it, to a fisherman catching and separating the fish, to a king in

<sup>1</sup> *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, xvi. 449.



all his royal dealings with his servants (Mt 18<sup>31ff.</sup>). The Kingly Rule of God is the Kingly activity of God. It is always sheer miracle. It is 'given.' Such a sovereignty from heaven by its very nature cannot represent a kingdom which could be established by a natural development, by some evolution from within the world, or by merely human exertions, but only by the intervention of God from heaven.

What is the purpose of this intervention? The Old Testament answer is contained in a New Testament phrase—to visit and redeem His people.

The deeds of Jesus in His earthly life, and the other references to Basileia in the apostolic writings prove that the purpose of the coming of the Rule of God was redemptive. In one sense the Rule of God is eternal. He is King, though not a single human being may acknowledge His kingship. In this sense it is 'beyond time,' to use Gloege's awkward phraseology. But the Rule is manifested in the time-process; it will finally 'come,' be fully manifested, as in heaven, so on earth. Therefore the emphasis of Jesus is directed to that 'coming.' His teaching is set in a framework of apocalyptic. Eschatology essentially implies a soteriology.

In a sense the Rule of God for the mind of Jesus is already present, not only because the Rule is eternal, but because the future manifestation is already breaking into the present age. Gloege cites Schmoller: 'Die Jetztzeit gehört schon zur Endzeit.' The present already belongs to the time of the End. In a volume (*Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes*, 1931, p. 29) which on the decisive positions is in agreement with Gloege, Dr. H. D. Wendland greets this principle as important for the solution of our problem.

But a second principle is discoverable in the teaching of our Lord. The Rule of God is already present in the deeds of Jesus Himself, because Jesus is the Messiah, the Christ of God. 'If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then is the Rule of God come upon you.' 'Something greater than Solomon is here.' The very proclamation with which Jesus begins His public ministry points to the same conclusion. 'The Rule of God has drawn near.' All the healing deeds of Jesus are signs that the future age, which according to the prophets and apocalyptists should witness such marvels, was now anticipated in One whose activity was as the activity of God Himself. He expected that those who received these benefits at His hands should give glory to God, for such was the purpose of His working. In Hebrew thought forgiveness

was one of the gifts of the Messianic Age. Jesus offers it. Forgiveness of sins is not, of course, to be identified with the Rule of God. But it is an introduction to the communion with God which was to be abiding and universal in the Messianic Age. It was a sign that the gracious power of God was already breaking into the present. And this forgiveness was proclaimed by and mediated through Jesus. The evidence that the Kingly Rule of God and the Kingly Rule of Christ are equated is overwhelming,<sup>1</sup> and justifies the frequent use in these modern researches of Origen's word *αὐτοβασιλεία* as the ultimate solution of our problem. Before Origen, Marcion had already pointed the way: *In evangelio est dei regnum Christus ipse*.<sup>2</sup> In the gospel the Kingdom of God is Christ Himself.

It is clear that according to this interpretation of the eschatological data of the teaching of Jesus, a Christology is essential to it. And it is an exalted Christology from the very beginning. He was the bearer of the supreme word of God in a sense in which no prophet of the past had ever been. As He sowed this word in men's hearts, a new process was set up, which was destined to reach its culmination in the End of the Age. The reproach has often been brought against Apocalyptic that it represents God as acting 'with such utterly disconcerting suddenness and discontinuity.'<sup>3</sup> But this is not true of the teaching of Jesus. The Parables of the Sower and of the Seed growing secretly prove that time is allowed for the Word to 'win its widening way.' God's Rule operates in the present order, though it is only fully manifested at the End. Both Parables refuse to be interpreted after the fashion of nineteenth-century evolutionary thought, as though the Rule were gradually being evolved. The essential idea is that from the unnoticed beginning to the triumphant End, the work is all of God, whose Rule embraces both the present age and that which is to come, but is only fully manifested in the future. In Jesus the Rule was already present.

From this point we may trace the originality of the teaching of Jesus, whereas on the view of Schweitzer it was always difficult to distinguish the view of Jesus from that of His contemporaries. In the first place the Kingly Rule was already present. The Age to come was anticipated. You do not need to practise observation, to wait till one says to you, Here it is! or, There it is coming! It is

<sup>1</sup> It is collected by K. L. Schmidt in *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, 581-2, 590-2.

<sup>2</sup> Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion*, iv. 33.

<sup>3</sup> See von Hügel, *Essays and Addresses* (1921), 133.

among you. 'This is the message, new, strange, and amazing, the paradox in the preaching of Jesus, that will not suit either the people of His own time or the learned men of to-day.'<sup>1</sup>

Secondly, while Jesus took up the basic ideas of the popular hope, He purged it of national exclusiveness. To use the expressive word of Gerhard Kittel, he 'depoliticized' it. The Beatitudes are the proof of this. 'The kingdom which breaks into time and into the world, is in every respect the act of God and nothing else.'<sup>2</sup> Those who shall receive the Rule of God must put away the idea that by their own fulfilment of the Law they can constrain the Rule of God to come to pass. If Jesus grants to the Twelve the responsibility of judges (Mt 19<sup>28</sup>=Lk 22<sup>29f.</sup>), it is not because the Jew has any special claim upon God. 'He can and will be put to shame in "the Day of Judgment."'<sup>3</sup>

Thirdly, the quality of the divine gift to sinners is another evidence of the distinction of the thought of our Lord.<sup>4</sup> The Kingly Rule brings salvation to such as these. Jesus teaches a new quality of divine love, a love that seeks out the sinner. 'A faith in God as Jesus preached it, whereby God gives Himself to the sinner—that was the death of all earnest moral striving, that was nothing else but blasphemy against God. For that the Jews brought Jesus to the Cross.'<sup>5</sup> In the fourth place, Jesus offered a new life on a supernatural level to sinners thus sought out and won back to God. The demands laid down in the Sermon on the Mount are so impossible that they presuppose the supernatural grace for their accomplishment. The perfect life of love enjoined on the followers of Jesus is itself a gift of God.

II. THE 'CHURCH.'—So far we have examined the eschatological conception of the Kingdom in the light of Jesus' conception of God, and of God's relation to the world. We have insisted that we must reject the nineteenth-century conception of the Kingdom as a community, and the far older

conception which identifies the Kingdom on earth with the Church. The question then arises: Does this newer interpretation allow for the conception of the Church as belonging to the mind of our Lord? The answer is a most emphatic 'Yes.' The newer interpretation lays far greater stress on the Church than the Protestantism of the nineteenth century, and indeed far more than is customary among most Protestants to-day. Dr. Visser-t-hooft has recently said, as a spokesman of the younger generation, that Protestantism steadily refuses to take the Church seriously. But at least we may point to the work of numerous theologians as a proof that the night of neglect is already far spent. Professor H. L. Goudge has said that the two dominating doctrines of the Old Testament are first, that of the redeeming God, and second, that of Israel, the People of God. This is the right starting-point for the discussion of the doctrine of the Church in the New Testament. It is true to say that for the early Christian the Church goes back to the time of Abraham. It is hardly correct even to say that Jesus founded the Church. He reconstituted it. The proud consciousness of being the true inheritors of God's promises in the Old Testament to Israel is manifest in St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the First Epistle of St. Peter, and finds a quaint expression in the Epistle of Barnabas. In the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus the ordination prayer for the bishop has the following for its second sentence: 'Thou hast appointed the borders of Thy Church by the word of Thy grace, predestinating from the beginning the righteous race of Abraham.' Such was the early Christian conception. Can we trace the idea of the *Ecclesia* as fundamental in the mind of our Lord?

There are various indications that He had the life of a community in view. The teaching of love as the supreme law assumes it. Some of the figures used to describe the eschatological hope—the marriage feast, the eating and drinking in the Kingdom—imply a perfected society in the Messianic Age. Jesus gathered a community to be the missionaries of the Kingdom; to them He said: *It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.* 'The implied O.T. references in the parable of the Mustard Seed (to the tree of Nebuchadnezzar's empire in Daniel, and the Cedar-Tree of Ezekiel) suggest that the life of a society is in view.'<sup>6</sup> The Kingly Rule of God creates a society through which He obtains fuller obedience in the world of men.

Rudolf Otto has recently laid great stress on a

<sup>6</sup> C. H. Dodd in *Theology*, May 1927, p. 260.

<sup>1</sup> Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, i. (1932), 41.

<sup>2</sup> Kittel in *Theology*, May 1927. Sanday long ago—*The Life of Christ in Recent Research* (1908)—pointed out how unsatisfactory was the position of Schweitzer, that there was no political element in the Messianic expectation of the Jews.

<sup>3</sup> K. L. Schmidt, *Theologisches Wörterbuch* (1933), 587.

<sup>4</sup> Proof is given by Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, i. (1922), 180-1. So Gloege, 154-5.

<sup>5</sup> Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ii. 11.



logion behind which even Bultmann admits a genuine tradition :

I will destroy this temple, made with hands,  
And in three days another [made without hands]  
will I build (Mk 14<sup>58</sup>).

There are many other echoes of this saying (Mk 13<sup>2</sup> and parallels; Mt 26<sup>61</sup>, Mk 15<sup>29</sup>, Jn 2<sup>19</sup>, Ac 6<sup>14</sup>). We may agree with Bultmann that we can lay no stress on the contrast of adjectives (*χειροποίητον* and *ἀχειροποίητον*). But the words manifest a consciousness in the mind of Jesus that He will raise up a new edifice, a new home for the worship of the Ecclesia of God.<sup>1</sup>

It was Kattenbusch who in his essay<sup>2</sup> of 1921 showed from Dn 7<sup>9-28</sup> that the idea of an *Ecclesia* of the saints of the Most High could be regarded as inherent in the framework of apocalyptic thought, and he defended, against Harnack, the much disputed saying of Mt 16<sup>18</sup>, *On this rock I will build my church*. In this he has been followed by Karl Ludwig Schmidt,<sup>3</sup> and the two discussions have set the question of its authenticity in a new light. It is

<sup>1</sup> Otto, *Reich Gottes u. Menschensohn* (1934), 48.

<sup>2</sup> *Festgabe für Harnack*, 160 ff.

<sup>3</sup> 'Die Kirche des Urchristentums,' in the *Festgabe für Deissmann* (1927). See also the full discussion in H. D. Wendland, *Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes* (1931), 164-187.

impossible to go further into the question in this article. But even if a commentator so conservative as McNeile (*Gospel of St. Matthew*, 1915) is justified in rejecting the authenticity of v.<sup>19</sup> (I will give thee the keys . . .), the idea of the ecclesia remains an integral part of the eschatological interpretation of the Kingly Rule of God.

The two ideas are correlative. The Rule creates the Church. It is incorrect to say that in the later parts of the New Testament the Church 'supplants' or 'supersedes' the Kingdom.<sup>4</sup> If the Kingly Rule of God falls out of the early Christian mind, there is no doctrine of the Church left to supersede it. It is the conviction of the present writer that although Calvin himself fell into the mediæval error of identifying the Kingdom of God on earth with the Church, yet Calvin's doctrine of the Church is closer to the New Testament and to the essential facts of the Christian religion than any other in the history of theology.

In conclusion, then, we may say in the technical language of K. L. Schmidt, that the modern studies show how Jesus' conception of the Kingly Rule of God essentially involves a soteriology, a Christology, an ecclesiology. There is a basis more than sufficient for the later thought of the Church on the saving Work of Christ, His Person, and His People.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Wendland, *op. cit.* 165.

## Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG.

WITHIN the last few years considerable sidelight has been cast on Solomon's life and activities by archaeological and historical investigations. We have now fairly accurate information of his build-ings, the topography of his capital, and his political and commercial administration. Recently an expedition of archaeologists and scientists has made a careful examination of the copper mines in Edom (the territory extending from the Dead Sea southward to the Gulf of Akabah), which are believed to have been worked by him. The exploring party, which consisted of Professor Nelson Glueck, Dr. Cyrus Gordon, Mr. R. G. Read (Inspector of Antiquities), and a number of Arab guides and guards, made several journeys through the country

in various directions, and altogether examined every Bronze and Iron Age site of any consequence. They found evidence everywhere, as all travellers have done, of the well-developed civilization of the Nabatæans, who founded a flourishing kingdom there in the fourth century B.C., building many of their settlements over the earlier Edomite ones, which they completely destroyed. The main object of the expedition, however, was rather to examine the Edomite sites and copper mines, which date from the time of the Israelite monarchy or earlier. We know that mining operations were carried on farther south, at Sinai, by the Egyptian kings of the fourth, fifth, and twelfth dynasties. But very little has hitherto been known of the

Edomite mines, which appear to have been more numerous than the Sinaitic ones.

The expedition found rich veins protruding above the surface in several districts, such as *en-Nahash*, *Feinân* (the site of the Biblical Punon), *Meniyeh*, and others. At *en-Nahash* they discovered a large enclosure, eighty-three yards square, with walls six feet thick, which has the appearance of a prison camp. 'It is possible,' Professor Glueck says, 'that the mines and furnaces were worked with forced labour, particularly during the reign of Solomon, since it is known that he introduced a *corvée* into Israel.' At *el-Amad*, between *Shôbek* and *Feinân*, they found a large copper mine, about forty-four yards long and twenty-two wide, cut into the face of a sandstone cliff. There are five large pillars upholding the entrance, and numerous ones inside supporting the roof. These were left when the ore was mined, in order to prevent the roof from caving in. They are about six feet high and three feet wide. The party found it necessary to crawl into the mine at the entrance, owing to the debris of centuries accumulating there, but once inside it was possible to stand upright. The pick lines left by the tools of the miners in the days of the Israelites are visible yet, and the walls and roof are still black with smoke. At *Meniyeh*, about eighteen miles north of the Gulf of Akabah, they examined what must have been the largest and richest mining centre in the country. Here there are traces of a great acropolis, measuring 366 yards by 142, with watch-towers at the corners which appear to have guarded six separate mining camps in the vicinity. The existence of such ancient mines reminds us forcibly of the remarkable poetic passage in the Book of Job (28<sup>1-11</sup>), and shows that the processes of mining nearly three thousand years ago were not dissimilar to those of the present day, except in the use of machinery and powerful explosives. It reminds us also of the 'brazen serpent' which Moses made in these regions and erected on a pole. It is evident that there would be no difficulty in making such an object from the copper and iron deposits which have been rediscovered there by the expedition.

Solomon, it is not generally known, made part of his wealth by foreign trading, at which he was an expert. He seems not only to have engaged in the business of horse-dealing, but to have worked the Edomite mines in company with the Phœnicians (c. 960 B.C.). He used the copper ore as his chief export article and his main stock-in-trade. Once in three years, his ships were loaded with it and other commodities at Ezion-geber (at the head of

the Gulf of Akabah), and sailed down the Red Sea to Put and Ophir (and probably to India), bringing back gold, silver, ivory, precious wood, apes, and peacocks (1 K 10<sup>22</sup>). In this enterprise he was joined by Hiram, the Phœnician king, whose country had inherited a right-of-way by the Gulf. Discussions have recently been revived as to where Put and Ophir were. The former region, which is mentioned four times in the Old Testament, has been identified by most scholars with 'Punt' of the Egyptian inscriptions (the assimilation of the *n* occurred among all Semites), and its location is revealed to us by a fragmentary text recording the war of Nebuchadrezzar II. (c. 605 B.C.) against Amosis, an Egyptian ruler. We read there of a land called *Putu Yaman*, from which we gather that Put was a portion of Yemen, the name for the south-west corner of Arabia, on the east coast of the Red Sea. It is not impossible, of course, that Put represented the land on both sides of the Red Sea at this part. At all events, that this was the locality is corroborated by Sir Flinders Petrie, who states that the name remains on the islet of *Ha-Fun*, at about 10° 20' north. As to the location of Ophir, this much disputed question seems to be settled by the cuneiform records of Elam, dating from the second millennium B.C., from which we learn that 'Apir' was the territory lying between Susa and the Persian Gulf. A beautiful gold scabbard (dated as far back as 2000 B.C.) has recently been discovered by M. Dunand at Byblos, in Phœnicia, containing on both its faces pictures of an expedition to Ophir and back. One particularly interesting scene is that of the king directing operations at the start, and another is that of a servant leading home a baboon on a leash.

It is well known, from the reports of French and German travellers, including recent accounts by Carl Rathjens and Hermann von Wissmann, that a great civilization once existed in South Arabia. Though this country was probably the original home of the Semitic race, it is still one of the least known regions of the world. A few months ago, M. Malraux, a French aviator, discovered mysterious ruins in the interior of it, about eighty miles north of Mareb, which in turn is about two hundred miles north of Aden. They are said to be of white marble, and include twenty or more square towers or temples of a Semitic type of architecture. They are regarded by Arabian authorities as the ruins of the ancient city of Saba (Sheba), whose queen (believed to be Bilkis), no doubt interested in Solomon's commercial activities, visited him with a camel-train of spices, gold, and precious stones.



At Lachish (*Tell Duweir*) Mr. J. L. Starkey has dug down through the city foundations to the early Bronze Age level (2600-2000 B.C.), and has found numerous sherds there and 'cup' hollows of olive presses. He has also discovered on the western outskirts of the town some caverns and pockets in the rocks filled with domestic debris, and caves used as dwellings by the people of this early period, as well as a large necropolis of a little later date. A most interesting discovery is that of a curious tunnel, about four feet wide and a little less in height, cut longitudinally beneath the sloping Hyksos revetment of the town. The floor is covered with limestone dust, hardened by the passage of innumerable human feet moving along it in the stifling atmosphere of the cramped space. It is difficult to conjecture the object of such a tunnel. It may have been the work of indefatigable Egyptian sappers, during the campaigns of the eighteenth dynasty, attempting to undermine the fortifications, or more probably may have been a secret means of exit, not unlike the two tunnels at Old Gaza, which Sir Flinders Petrie considered to be of this nature. In the town itself the ancient temple, dating from the fifteenth to the thirteenth centuries B.C., has now been laid bare. Among the finds are not only bowls, lamps, and other temple articles, but the remains of a large collection of toilet objects in alabaster, faience, glass, and ivory, all broken unfortunately into fragments. A square altar has been uncovered of unbaked mud brick, approached by three steps, and with a small hearth at the base of it; and there are two rooms behind for the use of the priests. Round the sides of the temple are long narrow benches, the back one built against the wall, and other two in front. There is some evidence that the whole building was covered with a flat mud roof, supported by wooden beams. Only two specimens of inscriptional material have come to light, but these are most important. One is on a broken piece of bowl, and the meaning is uncertain. It has been considered to be a rough attempt at Egyptian hieroglyphics, but it clearly consists of ancient Phœnician characters closely related to the Sinaitic. The writer has shown a photograph of it to M. René Dussaud, the distinguished Phœnician epigraphist, who confirms this view. The other inscription is on a tall ewer, about two feet in height, made of red ware. Though broken into about forty fragments, it has been re-formed and shows some animal decorations, with an inscription above, also in the Sinaitic script. The most likely translation seems to be 'A gift to Shôr (El), Môt, and Elath,'

who were the three principal divinities at Ras Shamra. The former inscription may be dated about 1600 B.C., and the latter about 1250 B.C.

Professor Garstang has now given an account of his fourth season at Jericho, and it is interesting to note that the results corroborate the historical conclusions already arrived at regarding the early date of the entry of the Israelites (c. 1400 B.C.) and other matters. The area excavated this last season was the piece of rising ground overlooking the perennial spring and known as 'Spring-hill' (the Quell-Rügel of the earlier German expedition). Here Professor Garstang excavated down to the Hyksos layer (c. 1800-1600 B.C.), where he found more than fifty storerooms stocked with great jars, in which there were still traces of grain or the dregs of barley-beer. This whole system, he found, was destroyed about 1600 B.C., probably by the avenging Pharaohs. But within fifty years, to judge by the pottery fragments, the work of restoration commenced, and a local dynasty was reinstated as vassal of Egypt. The new city continued until about 1400 B.C., when it came suddenly to an end through an intense conflagration, which in places baked and cracked the bricks and left a knee-deep layer of charcoal and white ash. The scarabs, pottery, tombs, and other evidences leave no doubt as to the date; and the occupation ended by this catastrophe was not resumed, as in previous instances of partial destruction. 'Spring-hill,' like the rest of the city, lay in ruins for about three hundred years, when a new people with a different culture established themselves on the site. All material details seem to have taken place as described in the Biblical narrative. 'The link with Joshua and the Israelites,' says Professor Garstang, 'is only circumstantial, but it seems to be solid and without a flaw.' It is worth noting that a fifth expedition to the famous site left in November, principally to excavate the still earlier settlements that exist beneath the ruins already systematically explored. It is possible that contacts may be found with the early Elamite or Sumerian civilization. At all events we may look for fresh tidings soon from the Jericho zone.

Sir Flinders Petrie's recent excavations at Palestinian sites have given us much enlightenment as to the conquest of Judah by Shishak, the first king of the twenty-second Egyptian dynasty (c. 947-925 B.C.). This conqueror, whose proper name is Sheshenqu ('he of Susa'), appears to have been an Asiatic, probably Persian or Caspian. In accordance with this, Sir Flinders found at Gerar, in the Shishak stratum, some pottery chariot

models, box-shaped, with a figure seated inside, these being similar to models found in Assyria and the regions beyond. Shishak seems to have brought with him from Asia the traditions of massive building. He set up a great stele of triumph at Megiddo, and built immense walls at Gerar, Bethpelet, and other towns, with millions of large bricks made out of clay brought from a distance. His invasion of Palestine (1 K 14<sup>25ff.</sup>) could not have been a mere raid, as some scholars have supposed, but must have been a powerful revival of Egyptian rule, and he continued to hold south Palestine for several years. Solomon had married the daughter of the previous king of Egypt, Pasebkhaneu (c. 976-947 B.C.), and it was only after Solomon's death and the consequent weakening of Judah that Shishak was able to venture on his looting conquest.

In connexion with the excavations of Gerar, there was found in the level of the twenty-second dynasty a board with thirty peg-holes, divided into three rows of ten each, which was meant as a tally-board or diary for a thirty-day month, and was a contrivance introduced from Egypt. Another

tally of a similar kind, of date about 700 B.C., was also found, consisting of a stone marked with three rows of fourteen strokes each, which was evidently intended as a fortnightly reckoning, and thus gives proof of a seven-day week at that early date. Of more importance from the Biblical point of view is a seal of date about 950 B.C., which was discovered at Gerar some time ago, but has not been properly understood until recently. It now turns out that the signs are reversed and read, 'Shemya, son of Meqyla.' This is clearly the 'Shimeah, son of Mikloth,' mentioned in 1 Ch 8<sup>3a</sup>, and belonging to the Benjamite tribe. The seal thus affords a remarkable confirmation of the Biblical record and overturns Cheyne's idea that the name 'Mikloth,' as we have it, is a corruption of 'Jerahmeel.' One cannot help noticing how strongly the results of archaeological discovery are verifying the accuracy of the Biblical narratives, even in circumstantial detail and local colouring. If the excavations at Samaria are continued, as the promoters have now suggested, it is not improbable that Hebrew ostraca of greater value than any yet found may come to light.

---

## In the Study.

### *Virginitus Puerisque.*

#### The Streamlined Life.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. GOULD, B.A., B.D.,  
RAMSGATE.

'I have learned . . . to be content.'—Ph 4<sup>11</sup>.

A STRANGE sort of motor-car has been making its presence seen and heard in our streets during the last few months. A weird motor-car indeed, which looks as if, before it finally came out of the factory, somebody had hammered away at the top of what we used to call the 'bonnet,' and pushed the bonnet back and over, so that, instead of going straight up and straight back, it curves over in a very remarkable way. And then, as if the workman in the factory wanted to balance things up, it seems as though he had gone round to the back of the car and done exactly the same thing there. The result is this weird-looking affair, which we call the 'streamlined' car. I expect you have seen many of them; and now, I see, they are making streamlined lorries, and, even more remarkable, streamlined trains. The latest effort in this direction

looks strangely like a huge cigar, tapering off at the front and rear, almost to a point.

So the streamlined motor-car, lorry, and train have arrived. Of course, you know the idea. It is quite simple really, and the only wonder is that nobody thought of it long ago. The whole idea is to produce a vehicle in which resistance to the air is cut out, or cut down to the very lowest possible point. The streamlined car is so built that there are no odd bits sticking out here and there, because such sticking-out bits offer resistance to the air through which the car is moving, and so reduce its speed. If you look carefully at the next streamlined car you see, notice how every part that might have stuck out is cut out. And so, as the car moves along the ground, the resistance set up against the air, which begins as soon as the ground leaves off, is reduced almost to nothing. So streamlining spells greater speed than ever could be possible while cars were built with all kinds of bits and pieces sticking out all round.

I wonder whether you have ever thought about having a streamlined life? Of course, the idea



behind these weird motors was known long ago. For instance, when a boy cycles along against a head-wind, as we call it, when it is hard going, you know what he does? He bends down over the handlebars, and finds how much easier it is to get along even against the wind. In other words, he 'streamlines' himself! People knew about that long ago, but what I am suggesting to you just now is that we can live the streamlined life. We can have ourselves streamlined!

That doesn't mean that we go under an operation to have bits cut off us, but it means that we learn the secret which the man who wrote our text had learned—'how to be content.' He had been able to go very swiftly on the errands of Jesus Christ, his Master and ours, because he had learned, in whatever circumstances he found himself—and sometimes they were very awkward circumstances—to be content with what God had given him, and to rest content with the work he had in hand.

His was truly a 'streamlined life.' Mind you, that doesn't mean that he went through life taking the path of least resistance. That is why we are called human beings and not motor-cars, or any other kind of machinery. Paul knew when to stick out for what he knew was right: there were times when he had to stick out his chin, and take a very firm line of action, but his splendid life was a streamlined one none the less, because he had learned how to be content. He wasn't always grouching about life, and moaning because other people had such splendid opportunities and gifts which were denied to him. Oh no . . . he started out by seeing what his job was to be . . . 'to be a servant of Jesus Christ,' then by seeing that God would never have picked him for that job without giving him strength to do it with all his might, and, finally, when he had done his best, to reap the reward of true contentment . . . that is the streamlined life. Paul never heard that name for it, but so it was.

Next time you see a streamlined car, lorry, or train, don't forget to say to yourself, 'I can have a life like that.' You can have a life that moves swiftly to do the will of God, out of which have been taken those ugly, selfish, petty things that stick out all round, and spoil the streamline effect, and slow the wheels of your life.

You can; but you cannot buy it: unlike the car, lorry, or train, it is not 'For Sale.' You can't buy it, but you can LEARN it, if you are ready to go to the same school as Paul attended, and sit at the feet of the same Teacher and Lord.

### Biggest First!

BY THE REVEREND SIDNEY H. PRICE,  
GREAT SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

'In honour preferring one another.'—Ro 12<sup>10</sup>.

A film photographer in the African jungle has recently made an interesting discovery about the behaviour of wild animals when they come to drink. Many animals arrive at the water-hole at the same time, but they all give way to the elephant. He is the biggest, so he must drink first. When he has finished, the rhinoceros takes his turn, followed by the giraffes, and fourthly come the zebras. After them, the rest may take their turn when and how they can, but these four are always given preference and keep to this order.

Animals are known to travel forty or fifty miles for a drink. Some of them are deadly enemies when they meet on any other occasion, but here, at the water-hole, they observe a truce.

The order of the jungle, then, is biggest first, and that may well be a good method of keeping some measure of law and order in the jungle.

Biggest first! That sounds strangely like something I have heard elsewhere, about a boy who wants first innings at cricket. 'Well,' he says, 'I'm the biggest.' Another boy might as reasonably plead, 'I'm the youngest, or the eldest, or the smallest.' In any case, it is not a very nice way of behaving, to want the best or first.

I once heard how a wise mother settled a little dispute of that nature. She must have been wise to have acted as she did. She had two boys, and they had one apple, so of course the question arose as to which of them should cut it. At last, the mother settled it like this, 'You shall divide it because you are the elder, and your brother shall have first choice of the pieces because he is the younger.' I imagine that apple was very fairly divided.

The order of the jungle is never very satisfactory amongst boys and girls or men and women, or, for that matter, nations either.

The winter of 1916 was very severe. One night two British soldiers were in charge of two German prisoners behind the line. All four men were shivering with cold when they came to a free canteen. Soon, two mugs of steaming hot cocoa were provided for the British soldiers. They looked at their miserable prisoners, then said, 'What about our guests, Hans and Fritz? Let them drink first,' and both men handed over their cocoa. Wouldn't you have liked to have been one of those British soldiers? Well, never mind, we

can all behave like them every day if we choose to do so. We can all do unselfish things.

When nations and men live like animals in the jungle, big and strong nations want precedence over smaller ones. That sometimes leads to quarrels and even to war. We can all help to prevent any more wars by behaving as those two soldiers did during war-time, thinking of the needs of others first. Jesus always did that, and you and I as His followers can do the same.

If the boy or girl by your side were Jesus, you would gladly give Him the first and the best of everything, and Jesus says He wants us to think of other people like that. 'As you have done it unto one of these my brethren, you have done it unto me.'

### The Christian Year.

SEPTUAGESIMA.

Masterless Men.

'And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing idle, and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us.'—Mt 20<sup>6, 7</sup>.

It is a standing rule with the parables of Jesus that we must not stretch their meaning beyond the point they were meant to illustrate. Yet such was the genius of Christ that there is hardly a parable of His but in phrase after phrase illuminates with unerring insight some tract of life and shows us how it looks under the light of God. This Parable of the Vineyard is a case in point. It was meant to set forth how God rewards our work, not according to the surface measure of its amount, but according to the secret standards of grace, taking into consideration all sorts of things, which

the world's coarse thumb

And finger failed to plumb,

So passed in making up the main account.

Yet as Christ passes on to this conclusion, He illuminates, by the way, what must be to-day a burning question for every honest Christian mind. It is the great number of those who stand outside the Kingdom of Christ who have never been won by Christ or by any great spiritual loyalty.

In feudal days most of the men of the country were attached to the great barons to whom they had sworn their service in return for certain rights. But there was always a number who had no such allegiance—masterless men they were called. Countless people to-day from the spiritual point of view might be described as masterless men. They

may dabble in theosophy, or have an interest in spiritualism or other forms of the occult. They may have a few cut-and-dry formulas by which they claim to rule their lives, such as doing the best they can and letting the future take care of itself; or, as one prominent man described him, getting as much happiness out of life as he could without interfering too much with the happiness of other people. But for the most part there is no fixed light within, no definite ideal, and, above all, no sense of a leader in life's journey.

Why is it that, after so many years of Christian teaching, so many have not been won for any definite Christian ideal? That is the question which the Parable asks. The answer is striking. 'They say unto him, because no man hath hired us.'

One thing is clear. The reason does not lie in the nature of the men themselves. No man is exiled from God by any disqualification of nature. The truth lies all the other way. As John Masefield puts it on the lips of the Widow in the Bye Street speaking a last word to her prodigal son:

God dropped a spark down into everyone,  
And if we find and fan it to a blaze  
It'll spring up and glow like—like the sun,  
And light the wandering out of stony ways.

1. 'Because no man hath hired us.' The first conclusion which suggests itself is *that they have never had the call*. This is the simplest answer. May it not be true? How little there is of the spiritual note, let alone the definitely Christian note, in the appeals made to the masses and classes in our country by many of our leaders. One cannot help feeling that masses of our people are derelict to-day because they have never been reached by any breath of higher inspiration. We have not got them for the highest, because we have systematically approached them on the lower side of their nature—the appeal to fear, to personal advantage, to the pocket, to mere selfishness.

Or think of Christian preaching. One would imagine there had been plenty of that. But is this true? How many thousands are there who pass our church doors without the faintest idea of what the Church stands for, and what the message of the evangel really is, because they have never heard it? As a writer says: 'The tragic thing is not that men, knowing what Christianity is, will reject it. It is that, not knowing what it is, they will have nothing to do with it.' There is abundant ground for asking ourselves, whether the Church of to-day is not failing in the mission of the evangel toward large masses of our people.



But there is more. We need the authentic note in our Christian *lives*. If we were to ask some of those who stand outside, would they not be apt to reply that there is nothing in the lives of many Christian people which speaks of God.

Walter Pater, in one of his books, tells of a Roman lad who was attracted to a young Roman soldier of his chance acquaintance because of a certain something in his life which drew him strangely and touched a deep chord in his soul. As they drew close together he asked what it was, and he found that this soldier lad was a Christian, and, bit by bit, in spite of his superstition, he was drawn toward Christ—drawn by that accent of Christian character which called to him as deep calls to deep.

There was a time when Christianity meant going into a monastery and shutting oneself off from many fine and noble things, because that was the only effective protest which men who wanted to live for Christ could make against the profligacy and sin of their age; but it does not mean that to-day. There was a time when it meant going out to the hills to worship, and being hunted and harried for the sake of spiritual freedom; but it does not mean that to-day. We have got to find out what it means to be a Christian man or woman in this age in which we live, with all our pressing problems. What kind of life does He demand? We can be sure it is something so strong, so fine, so heroic, so tender, that it would win hundreds of those who stand aloof because they have never been touched by the note of the authentic Christian spirit—the note that sings like music and challenges like a battle-cry. 'Why stand they all the day idle? Because no man hath hired them.'

2. But there are those who have never been won for Christ, because *they have not realized there was anything they could do in the vineyard*. Perhaps they did not know the Kingdom of God, into which He was calling them, *was* a vineyard. They had imagined, perhaps, it was only a fold, a place of shelter from the storms of life. It is quite true that is a picture Christ gives of the Kingdom.

But we have to take other pictures if we are to have Christ's message complete. His call is not always to the softer side of our nature, to its invalidism and its fears. He appeals to our strength. The Kingdom is a vineyard, a place of work. 'Why stand ye here all the day idle?'

Professor Gilbert Murray, discussing in a pamphlet what it was that sent so many of our young men out to the front at the beginning of the War, and sent them so gaily, so buoyantly, gives this answer:

that for the average man to find something to do which he can do, and spend his whole life in doing, is the secret of a very high happiness. Christ holds the key to that happiness. The final secret of a satisfying life is in Jesus. He wants something done which we can all do, and into which we can put every ounce of our being. He wants the Kingdom of God, the kingdom of righteousness and purity and love brought into being *by us*.

Sin worketh, let me work too.  
Sin undoeth, let me do.  
Busy as sin, my work I ply,  
Till I rest in the rest of eternity.

Death worketh, let me work too.  
Death undoeth, let me do.  
Busy as death my work I ply,  
Till I rest in the rest of eternity.

God's only way of breaking into life is by coming into our hearts. His only way of moving the world is by moving men. The power of all progress is in *our wills* given up to work the will of God wherever we are situated. The dynamic of progress is victorious personality. The greatest contribution we can make to life is just ourselves, redeemed and vitalized by the touch of Jesus. Stevenson's biographer sums up his life by saying, 'To do the work he did was a great achievement, but to be the man he was, was an achievement no less great.' That is the point. Whatever our work, the manhood we reach is always our greatest achievement. And the secret of true manhood is the mastery of Jesus.

3. Perhaps there are some who stand idle to-day because *they have never recognized the voice of Christ*. The voice is powerless because it is to them unreal. At best it is second-hand; and a leader whose personality never touches the lives of his men wins no allegiance. As Napoleon put it, 'When I was in my prime I could get thousands to follow me, but I had to be *there*.' It is the personal touch that does it. And there are those who cannot feel that Christ comes near them with a personal touch. It seems all unreal—this appeal—an echo from distant centuries which does not reach the heart to-day. But are we sure that we have listened for it? If there is anything in the Gospels, it is a message of a living Christ—a Christ who is with men—the same to-day as yesterday, in closer touch even than when He walked with His disciples in Galilee. The essence of the Resurrection is that Christ has been liberated from the bonds of space and time to become an ever-present Master.

How does Christ speak? He speaks within, in the shame that touches conscience, in the remorse that follows sin, in the ideals which attract us like the stars, in the great words of truth which once fell from His lips and which to-day strike home to our souls with an authority and power we cannot deny. He speaks in the wrongs that touch our chivalry, in the causes which call for our help, in the broken-hearted whom we long to heal. He speaks in the desperate longing for a higher life and a finer world to live in. How is it that these things awaken in us such feelings and make such appeals? When we read the New Testament we find them incarnate in Christ, so that the more we think of Him the stronger do they become. And when a man gives himself up to them there will steal in upon him the feeling that He is with him, a Comrade, a Friend. And that feeling will deepen into knowledge and conviction. It is this fellowship with a present Christ which keeps Christianity alive. It is a message ever renewed to us by One who speaks from heart to heart, and who is Himself 'the Way, the Truth, and the Life.' To listen for that message is to feel a new life taking possession of our nature and rising within us—a life which He begins to live in us, and we begin to live through Him.<sup>1</sup>

#### SEXAGESIMA.

##### Curiosity concerning Evil.

'Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.'—Gn 3<sup>d</sup>.

We cannot help being curious. If anything seems secret, we want to know it. So every man of us, especially in the opening years of manhood, is curious concerning evil. But we have to distinguish that curiosity into two sorts. We may have a curiosity to know evil directly through participation, or we may have a curiosity to know about it merely by observation. Concerning the former of these, it is extremely easy to make pronouncement. There are no problems and no difficulties here. Evil is evil, and no amount of curiosity excuses it. Here we must come down with a strong, definite, vertebrate judgment, 'this thing is wrong, and I will not do it.'

But as regards the latter, it is more easy to deceive ourselves. We do not propose to go over the line. We propose only to satisfy ourselves mentally. There are multitudes of men who are thus curious about evil, are interested in it, who want to know more about it, and in weak little ways are gratifying that curiosity. To any still, small voices that dis-

turb them they answer, 'Where is the harm? We, at any rate, run no risk.'

The China Inland missionaries, Miss Mildred Cable and Miss Francesca French, write in a recent book, *Something Happened*, as follows: 'The travellers listened, thought and pondered their own ignorance, while the Gobi warned them: "Hold your curiosity in check. There is no need for you to explore every avenue of questionable knowledge. In this trackless waste where every restriction is removed and where you are beckoned and lured in all directions, your safety is in austerity and in deliberately accepted limitations. One narrow way is the only road for you. In the great and terrible wilderness push on with eyes blinded to the deluding mirage, your ears deaf to the call of the seducer, and your mind undiverted from the goal."'

There is a good deal more than risk in proceeding to satisfy ourselves mentally. In the first place, filling our minds with knowledge about evil tends to deprive us of our supreme safeguard against it, namely, our power of being shocked at it. Is not that true? We know more of the world than once we did. Have we the same noble sensitiveness as once we had? Let a man contrast himself in this matter with the lad that once he was, and reflect awhile.

Secondly, to the strong, experience alone satisfies curiosity. Here, familiarity breeds, not contempt, but desire. Apart from the ministrations of God, we will taste, as well as want to know about, evil. It is a fearful and a wonderful thing that at this time of day men should think that they can nibble at sin and remain safe; that they can, so to speak, amuse themselves with iniquity outside office hours and yet keep the heart secure. Do we not know ourselves better than that? Listen to this description of a man's inner life that has been left for us. He is one who was carnal, sold under sin; who, what he hated, that he did; who could not find how to perform the good; who, when he would do good, found evil present with him; who was a wretched man, of all men most miserable. Who was that? Why, Paul, the strongest of the saints. So do not let lesser men boast too securely.

In the third place, if it should so happen that, through prudence or cowardice, a man remains righteous in act while base in desire, the gratification of curiosity leaves him permanently evil-curious. There is such a thing as the 'homing instinct of the mind.' We read with interest sometimes of the wonderful powers, which those specially trained birds have, that, when set loose, even far

<sup>1</sup> J. Reid, *The Victory of God*, 147.



at sea, at once spread their wings and make flight straight for the place of their home. After such manner are the minds that God has given us. At times they are chained. They are restrained by the compulsions of our daily tasks. But then evening comes and they are set free, and they also set their wings and fly unto their own place. What a destiny that suggests for those whose delight is in the base. Take heed unto the awful words, 'He that is filthy, let him be filthy still.'

Wherefore, we may conclude that only those have a right to inquire into evil who are experts coming to deliver; and that we should turn our curiosity upon the good and be anxious to know the secrets of heroism and of sacrifice and of righteousness, rather than the secrets of baseness and of lust. After all, in a universe which has been created by the Uncreated Loveliness, there are fair regions and to spare in which the mind may wander. Our business is, with God's help, to exercise the thought in them, so that each day will bring with it some fresh discovery of beauty, some fresh display of loveliness, and some new unravelling of the great secret, which is the secret of the friendship of God towards them that fear Him.<sup>1</sup>

We can see how all-important is the faculty of attention in forming the habits of a Christian character. How can we possibly expect to have a character that is Christlike if, during every day, our attention is disturbed by a thousand and one things that have nothing to do with Christ? We need resolutely to fix our attention on the thoughts and facts and aims which shall make for the accomplishment of our great object. A man cannot be a saint if he is perpetually attending to sin. And he cannot be a sinner if he is perpetually attending to the things of God. 'Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; whatever virtue there is, and whatever praise there is, *think on these things.*' It is true we cannot directly control our emotions, but we can establish an indirect control by means of this faculty of attention. 'Over feeling itself we have no direct power; it arises involuntarily in the presence of its existing object; but we *can* determine to what objects we will attend.'

Further, this faculty of attention is a highly important factor in withstanding the onset of temptation. There are few men strong enough, when temptation comes, to keep looking at it and still beat it back. For most men to look at tempta-

tion is to invite defeat. We cannot hope to conquer that way; but we can at least turn our attention to something else. 'The small boy, who is looking through a fence at a patch of water-melons that are not his, cannot prevent his mouth from watering, *but he can run.*' The advice sounds homely enough, but it follows a fixed psychological and spiritual law, and tallies with an age-long and world-wide Christian experience. 'An image is thrown upon the screen of your mind and you look at it. How can you dismiss it? You can only dismiss it by throwing another image on the screen which will be more beautiful, more pure, and more attractive, and which, above all, will preoccupy your mind, so that the other image will fade away.' St. Paul understood this law and insisted on it as only he could: 'Walk in the spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh.' 'Thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness'; 'bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.'<sup>1</sup>

'Make yourselves nests of pleasant thoughts,' says Ruskin. None of us yet knows, for none of us has yet been taught in early youth, what fairy palaces we may build of beautiful thoughts—proof against all adversity: bright fancies, satisfied memories, noble histories, faithful sayings, treasure-houses of precious and restful thoughts, which care cannot disturb, nor pain make gloomy, nor poverty take away from us—houses built without hands, for our souls to live in.

#### QUINQUAGESIMA.

#### The Quest for God.

'Oh that I knew where I might find him!'—  
Job 23<sup>1</sup>.

'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'—  
Jn 14<sup>9</sup>.

These words of Job are found in the third and final cycle of his controversy with his friends. Eliphaz had delivered his last speech. It was briefer than his earlier ones, and was direct, blunt, and even brutal. Maintaining his position that Job's sufferings must be the result of Job's sins, he described the kind of sins which would be likely to produce such sufferings; and by implication attributed them to Job, though he had no evidence. It was all speculative, and entirely false. His speech ended with advice to Job in a passage of great

<sup>1</sup> E. S. Woods, *Modern Discipleship and What it Means*, 48.

<sup>1</sup> J. R. P. Sclater, *The Enterprise of Life*, 32.

beauty, the first sentence of which expressed the whole of its appeal :

‘Acquaint now thyself with him.’

In his reply, Job ignored the charges which had been brought against him, and replied to the advice thus tendered. He tacitly admitted the excellence of the advice, but immediately, in the words we are considering, revealed the difficulty of which he was conscious. Bluntly Eliphaz had said, Get to know God, and all will be peace. Job replied in effect, That is the difficulty. How am I going to do it ? And in these actual words, ‘Oh that I knew where I might find him !’

That was the language of a man who had underlying convictions about God. It is conceivable that such a question might be asked flippantly. It is evidently possible for a man of brilliant intellect to write the story of a Black Girl's search for God with a knobkerry ; but a story characterized by such lack of seriousness is hardly worth attention. Job's query was not in that spirit. The context shows how conscious he was of the fact and presence of God. He knew He was at work, but declared that He was hiding Himself. Moreover, he was convinced that if he could find Him, ‘He would give heed’ to him ; and that ‘the upright might reason with him.’ Notwithstanding this double conviction of the fact of God, and of the justice of God, his difficulty was that he could not reach Him. In language of strange poetical beauty, and yet lucid declaration, he described his quest after God. He said, ‘I go forward, but he is not there. I go backward, but I cannot perceive him.’ I am conscious that He is at work, and I turn to the left, but cannot behold Him. He is on the right hand ; I know He is there, but He is in hiding, and I cannot see Him.

That is an abiding human consciousness when men seek for God on the earth level. They may be perfectly sincere.

Their search, like that of Job, may be the result of pressure and tribulation and suffering ; or it may be the search of the intellect for the solution of the riddle of the universe. God is not denied ; nay, there may be conviction that He is ; but He cannot thus be found. Man cannot make contact with God by any action which is earth-bound. On a low level of illustration, we may refer to people who tell us that they find God in Nature, and therefore have no need for the activities of worship. This is not true. They may see the evidences of God in Nature, for all creation is the vesture of Deity, wrought in beauty, and radiant with glory ; but God is never found in Nature in such a way as to

satisfy the deepest necessity of human life. This cry : ‘Oh that I knew where I might find him !’ is ultimately a revelation of the necessity for some special revelation of God to the spiritual side of the nature of man.

From this revelation of human necessity, as expressed in the cry of Job, we turn to the answer of Jesus. Many intervening centuries had run their course, and we find ourselves in an upper room with a group of men who have also known this desire of the spiritual life for God. In the midst of them there was One, a Man of their humanity, looking with human eyes at them, as they are looking at Him. Nevertheless, He is the One in whom all the eternal came into visibility. It was not the beginning of anything new in the eternal facts, but the shining forth of these facts upon human life. In this company there sat a quiet man who said exactly what Job said, if in other words, ‘Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.’

Much has been written about what Philip really meant. But the one certain thing is that he was seeking some vision which would certify God to his soul. Again it was an elemental cry of humanity in the measure in which humanity has lost its consciousness of God. To that cry the answer of Jesus was given in a clear, unequivocal declaration, ‘He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.’

That affirmation might be considered in many ways. We choose one only. Let us go back to Philip. When Jesus said to him, ‘Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip ? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father,’ He was asking Philip to look back over the period in which he had been with Him. Philip was one of the first disciples, and he had been with Jesus through the whole period of His public ministry. We have the account of four occasions in which he is seen in personal contact with Him.

The first was when Jesus sought him at the beginning, ‘Jesus findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Come and travel with me.’

Then much later in the course of our Lord's ministry, when the multitudes were thronging upon Him, and He was moved with compassion, it was to Philip that He talked. To him He said, ‘Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat ?’ He was not asking Philip for information, for John says, ‘This he said to prove him, for he himself knew what he would do.’ The issue was that Philip saw Him that day feed the multitude.

Then Philip was the man to whom the Greeks came with their request, ‘Sir, we would see Jesus.’ After consultation with Andrew, they came and



told the Lord. Philip listened to that marvellous answer of Jesus, beginning with the declaration, 'The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit'; and continuing presently He cried, 'Now is my soul troubled'; and later, 'Now is the judgment of this world.' Of course the whole of this answer should be read. These sentences are sufficient to show that our Lord was facing His Cross, and in spite of His experience of sorrow, saw through to its triumph. Philip was watching Him then.

Then in the Upper Room, certainly not long after this revelation at the coming of the Greeks, he had seen Jesus gird Himself with a towel, and bend in the attitude of a slave, and wash his feet. In all these things the Father was seen, seeking the man, meeting the hunger of the crowd and lifting the action into the realm of the spiritual in teaching; finally, facing and moving towards the infinite mystery of pain through which humanity could be ransomed and redeemed; bending until He took the place of a bond-slave, serving a group of men who believed in Him.

It may be well to remind ourselves that, all through the revelation of our Lord found in this Gospel, the words and the works are in mind, and always the words are treated as supreme; and the fact is emphasized that these were from God, and that the works were also the works of God. He then appealed to Philip and the rest in the words, 'Believe me . . . or else believe me for the very works' sake.' The first line of proof was Himself. 'Believe me' was a call to the consideration of His personality. 'Or else,' that is, if you cannot rise to the higher level of the understanding of My personality, then 'believe me for the very works' sake.' This challenge is an abiding one. If we will consider the Man Jesus, we are inevitably brought face to face with the fact that, through the human, something other than the human is for ever shining round about us. Let us take up the New Testament with its presentation of the Person of our Lord, in these gospel narratives, and open it at any point, and then carefully look at Him. We may find Him in Bethesda's porches among the derelicts. We may find Him with the children in His arms. We may find Him in the midst of the rulers with a sin-smirched woman in the midst of a watching crowd. Wherever we find Him—to adopt a mathematical method—let us project the lines from Him into infinitude, and we shall find we are seeing God.

John, in the Prologue of his Gospel, declares, 'We beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.' Thus, to the cry of humanity: 'Oh that I knew where I might find him!' 'Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us'; the answer is full and final, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

The question may still be asked by honest souls: How are we to know that these things that Jesus is reported to have said are so? In an earlier period of His ministry He had uttered the revealing words, 'If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God.' He thus declared that there must be first of all a supreme determination to do the will of God; and then that the proof that He spoke from God would be found.

Merely intellectual interest will never find God, even in Jesus. Job and Philip were seeking God because they were convinced of His government and His justice. They were therefore ready for revelation. Revelation did come to Job later on partially, but never fully. To Philip it was given in all its fulness in the Person of our Lord. Thus, the way in which the human soul can find the answer to its quest for God is revealed. When spiritual intention harmonizes with the universal law of righteousness, spiritual intelligence will discover that God was in Christ. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'<sup>1</sup>

#### FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

##### The Duty of saying 'No.'

'But he answered and said.'—Mt 4<sup>a</sup>.

The suggestions of the Temptation in the wilderness are such as must have occurred to that mind in those circumstances. They are not the ordinary promptings to the vulgar sins of pride, selfishness, or greed, which are enough for most of us. The moral defeat of the average man is, for the prince of darkness, a small matter. It can be left to a subordinate. As we put it, a post card will be enough. But this is special. The whole resources of the establishment must be enlisted. It demands the personal intervention of the chief himself.

All this may seem the language of mythology. If so, it is a mythology hard to escape from, and one for which there is a good deal to be said. All theories, even Bible theories, about the origin of evil carry us out of the world of our own experience. There must be conjecture, even if it be inspired

<sup>1</sup> G. Campbell Morgan, *The Answers of Jesus to Job*, 75.

conjecture. But it is just the seeming organization of the forces of evil, the fact that the appropriate temptations seem to be launched against each soul, that makes many thoughtful people unable to resist the conviction that there are evil spirits or an evil spirit. And it is clear, indeed, that the suggestions here are appropriate, what we should normally call *ad hominem*: in this case we may say *ad Dominum*. They are just the questions which the Lord, newly baptized of John, newly conscious that the time was come, newly conscious of a Kingdom to be established, and of a Kingship to be made effective, must surely face. They begin with, 'If thou art the Son of God.'

Shall He use His trust-powers for the satisfaction of His own innocent hunger? 'Command that these stones be made bread.' You have, or believe yourself to have, a master-key, which gives access to the world behind phenomena, where are devised the causes of events. I do not say, Use it as a toy, or just to satisfy an idle curiosity—that would be unworthy of a Son of God—but why not use it for the lawful, and indeed holy, purpose of providing the body with its daily bread? The Son of God, the Captain of mankind, must make the most of His resources. Health is a duty—nay, a condition for the doing of great work. I would not say, To do a great right, do a little *wrong*; that would make no appeal to you; I suggest no such thing. But I say, To do a great right, use the official sanction for the personal good, *which is* the public good. After all, the Man and the Messiah are the same person. It cannot have been intended that the Trustee of all this wealth Himself should starve. Why not a little dip into the public funds? Nay, it is not even that. No one would be the worse for it. For there is plenty more where that came from.

My Lord rejects this? Well, yes, I see. 'Man does not live by bread alone.' It is true indeed, and I am glad that spiritual vitality can compensate so notably. But still, there is the Kingdom to be established. The minds of men are slow, and hard to convince. What they want is miracle. They are familiar with the holy Bible words, which illustrate so exquisitely the care of the Heavenly Father for His chosen. How do they run?—'He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, and on their hands they shall bear thee up.' Surely Divine Providence was never more touchingly described. It is a metaphor? It means the spiritual care of character? Of course, but think of the effect on those dear, simple, literal minds, if you in very deed fulfilled the ancient prophecy of the Son of Man.

My Lord rejects this also? No miracle of that kind? Ah, yes, I see. The altruistic motive even here. A handicap in practice, but of course deserving of the highest commendation. Well, let us not think of miracle. It has occurred to me that man is political. The Jewish people are ripe for some movement, only waiting for a lead. Of course the real purpose is a spiritual kingdom, the Saviour reigning in the hearts and lives of men, but is it not true that you can proceed from the outward to the inward? There are the great promises of God to the Fathers—'I will make thy seed as the sand of the seashore, and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies.' Revive the ancient glories of Joshua and Judas Maccabæus. Put yourself at the head of a national, patriotic movement. The power of Rome is an unspiritual, soulless thing; it would be a work of pure piety to replace it by a glorious, divine theocracy. Then, in the *Pax Messianica* which will ensue, it will be easy to build up the purely spiritual fabric which we all desire.

Can we not recognize the specious arguments which we have often heard before? Whether they come from our own ingenuity, willing to rationalize a doubtful case, to make the worse appear the better reason, or from some other quarter, it is hard to say. One thing is certain. When we hear the story of the Lord's Temptation, *mutatis mutandis*, we have heard that kind of thing before.

The answer in the wilderness was 'No.' Sometimes that has to be the answer.

We stand at a cross-road. There is a broad path, promising its reward. It is not a grossly material reward. Most of us are armed pretty well against such undisguised seductions. It contrives to wrap itself somehow in some specious camouflage. It is able to point to power, responsibility, legitimate leisure, things of that sort, among the advantages that it can give. Are we to say 'No' to it? Are we to take the narrow path always? Not always. Some of the broad paths are deadly. No one ever took them and returned but as a cripple and with a constitution grievously impaired. But a path is not necessarily right because it is narrow, and a path is not necessarily wrong because it has rewards. But always there should be some capacity for saying 'No,' and there are some points at which it must be said. Such points will be reached a good many times every day. And the longer we let ourselves go unpractised in the moral art of saying 'No,' the more difficult it will be to begin. Sometimes, when it is really urgent, it has unhappily become impossible.

Sir Edward Burne-Jones in *Time Remembered*,



by Frances Horner, says: 'He [Newman] taught me so much I do mind—things that will never be out of me. In an age of sofas and cushions he taught me to be indifferent to comfort; and in an age of materialism he taught me to venture all on the unseen, and this so early that it was well in me when life began, and I was equipped before I went to Oxford with a real good panoply, and it has never failed me; so if this world cannot tempt me with money or luxury, and it can't, or honours or anything it has in its trumpery treasure house, it is most of all because he said it in a way that touched me—not scolding nor forbidding nor much leading—walking with me a step in front.'<sup>1</sup>

There is one more thing that must be added. A mere negation is never satisfactory; it is never the only thing that has to be said. There is no virtue in suffering just for the sake of suffering. If we say 'No,' we must have something to put instead of the rejected thing. A Lent observance which consisted entirely of doing without some bodily satisfaction would represent some slight economy in the household expenditure, and nothing else. The economy might, or might not, be noticeable, and worth making. If so, there is that to be said. If not, there is nothing to be said. It has no other relevance. The action has no repercussion in the spiritual world of character. Our Lord said, 'Man does not live by bread alone.' He would not shrink from the converse proposition, 'Man does not save his soul by abstinence alone.'

There is a word, now rather overworked, but nevertheless most convenient, the word 'sub-

<sup>1</sup> P. 120.

limation.' It is a new word, but the thing it describes has been practised by Christian people for centuries. This must not be done because it is wrong. Yet it appeals to powers that we possess. We know that it would give an outlet for those powers. *But* it is wrong. What can be done? We can do what Jeanie Deans did when she could not perjure her soul to save her sister's life, but walked from Edinburgh to London to appeal to the Queen's Majesty in person. Or we can do what John the son of Thunder did. His was the fiery nature which desired to call down fire from heaven on the inhospitable people of Samaria. Yet his final appearance on the field of history is as the Apostle of love. Had he weakened in the interval? Or had he turned his strength another way? What does St. Paul mean by 'having nothing, and yet possessing all things'? Does he mean that laborious self-denial will be rewarded by compensations in the life to come? Or does he mean that service may be freedom, and sacrifice may be happiness? 'Sublimation,' a modern word, an old, familiar, necessary thing.

It is certain that our Lord in the wilderness had a reason for His thrice repeated 'No.' He had an alternative policy, a positive purpose. Of that time it might be said of Him, as it was said of the later time when the conflict was even fiercer, and the forces of evil were all mustered for the final shock, 'For the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame.' There is only one thing to do with shame, and that is to despise it. There is only one motive that will make this possible, and that is some joy set before us.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> S. C. Carpenter, *The House of Pilgrimage*, 143.

## The Present Relations of Church and State.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. GARVIE, D.D., LONDON.

THE world-wide crisis—economic, political, and international—has in several lands resulted in the substitution of dictatorships of various types for democracy; and in justification of these the theory of the *totalitarian* state has been advanced. This claim by the State to direct and control the 'total' life and thought of a nation has necessarily raised the problem of the relation of Church and State in an acute form, and has challenged Christian thought to a serious consideration of it with a view

to its solution. I have already in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES called attention to phases of the German Church controversy, but now I am venturing on a discussion of the general problem.

### I.

(1) In the Hebrew nation Church and State were one; religion and politics were inseparable, but in Isaiah's *remnant* and Jeremiah's disciples a detach-

ment begins. The Jews returned from exile not a State but a Church, and the conflict of Church and State emerged. In the Maccabean revolt we have an instance of the struggle for religious liberty. The story of martyrdoms under the Roman Empire shows the danger of the *totalitarian* state to religion. Much of the theological thought of the Middle Ages was concerned with this problem; and the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in our own land offer instances of the dilemma—God or Cæsar, for not always is the solution our Lord commanded—God and Cæsar—possible. His teaching as well as that of the prophets lends support to the view that violent resistance of the State is not the duty of the Church; but patient endurance of the penalties it may inflict, if its behests are not obeyed. Some thinkers of last century believed that they had found a solution in the *slogan* 'A free Church is a free State'; but in view of the necessary extension of the functions of the State into many spheres of interest and activity and the welcome widening of the vision of the Church to Christianize all spheres, no such separation of spheres is possible. The State is claiming, and for the most part rightly, an expanding sphere, not so much of domination as of service; and the Church hears the call to pervade by the influence of Christ and His Spirit the whole range of human conduct. If the circles are not concentric, yet they do to a large extent intersect; and no question of to-day deserves a more thorough scrutiny and a more careful judgment by the Church than its relation to the State. We should in this study get down to the fundamental principles.

(2) We cannot, as did the thinkers of the Middle Ages, assume a Natural Law, expressive of the creative will of God, absolute before, relative after the Fall, because that event brought in a punitive element in God's dealings with man. We may, however, start with human personality, as a Christian idealism conceives it. Man as personal is rational, emotional, æsthetic, moral, religious, social. As spirit-in-body, he is related to, because dependent on, Nature; but that relation is not limited to the provision of material objects to meet his physical necessities (economics). He has an intellectual relation in his pursuit of knowledge of physical forces and natural laws (physics), an æsthetic in his appreciation of the beauty of Nature, a moral in the subordination of his physical needs to his personal interests (ethics), even a religious in his recognition of a divine presence, purpose, and activity in the physical universe (theism). The conquest of Nature is one of the elements of human progress, and his co-operation with his

fellows for this end demands the regulation of the State, so as to secure justice to all. As it is God's will that the bodily needs of His children on earth should be met by the abundant provision which He has made in Nature, and that man should by his labour claim for his own use this provision, the Church can approve any action of the State which helps and does not hinder this manifest purpose of God. So also any contribution the State can make to man's pursuit of truth and appreciation of beauty. It is, however, in the spheres of morals and religion that the problem of the relation of Church and State becomes most acute. A State may tolerate or even approve conduct which a Church may condemn, for example, the use of contraceptives and sterilization, or require beliefs and rites which religious conviction rejects, for example, the worship of Cæsar in Ancient Rome, or the oath of loyalty to Hitler in Modern Germany.

The individual is in all his interests and activities dependent on society, and Church and State are societies. Accordingly in investigating further their relations, we must form as clear a conception of what society is as we can.

(3) As having common interests and engaging in common activities, man constitutes with his fellows a *community*, and there may be as many kinds of community as there are interests and activities—domestic, industrial, cultural, moral, religious. Wherever and whenever man *wills* a relation with his fellows, there is a society. When he wills a society to give effect to community, he forms an *association* with others with a more or less rigid and permanent organization, as the conditions may demand. Such an association has regular and continued modes of common activity, and these are its *institutions*. To give the two relevant illustrations, Christian believers form a community of interest and activity because of their *common possession* (Koinōnia) of the Holy Spirit, through whom the revelation of God and the redemption of man through Jesus as Christ and Lord are continued. Their *association* together is the *Church* (ecclesia); among the *institutions* of this association which give practical effect to their *community* are the *ministry* and the *sacraments*. A *nation*, however constituted geographically, biologically, historically, is a *community*; its *association* as such is the State, its *institutions*, autocracy, democracy, parliament, cabinet, law-courts, police, army, navy, etc. There may be an association with its institutions wherever and whenever there is a community of interests and activities as the motive of, the reason for, the



willed relation of society. That man may exercise his liberty, realize his responsibility, develop his personality as fully as possible, it is desirable and even imperative that both Church and State should not discourage and prevent, but encourage and promote such associations and institutions, so long as their purpose and their method do not lessen the common good of the society which might be affected by them. The totalitarian state endangers these varied common interests and activities, when for its own ends it seeks to control such associations; and the Church in rejecting and resisting such interference is not only protecting, but is preserving the liberty, the ability, and the opportunity for the full expression of human personality. In a Nazi, Fascist, or Bolshevik State culture, character, and conviction are all imperilled, and need to present a common front of opposition; and on the Church there rests the duty of wise, righteous, and courageous leadership. The State is not the only association possible, desirable, legitimate; it has no claim to exclusive dominance in every sphere, although it may claim to be supreme in its own sphere, that it may discharge its own function. The community of interest and activity it represents and makes effective is the need of the preservation, the protection and the promotion of the common life in a society against aggression from another society, or conflict of the associations within itself with one another; its function is not merely to ward off invasion, or to maintain order among its subjects or citizens so as to prevent wrong or injury to person or property; but as a society develops, becomes increasingly a community, the promotion of any interest or activity which confers general benefit, and demands corporate action for economy and efficiency may be included in its province, such as sanitation, health, education, culture, morals. No rigid limit can be set to the extension of its functions, and no abstract definition can be given of those functions. A qualification regarding the authority of the State must be added. It claims the right, a right challenged only by *doctrine* anarchists, to use physical force to secure obedience to its commands, to effect its purposes. Whether such use of force is morally justified will depend on the content of the command, the character of the purpose. It is, however, a false view of the State that its authority rests on force only: if so, its authority has degenerated into a tyranny. A State is an organ of community only as it is so functioning as to fulfil the purpose generally accepted in the society, which it is representing and for which it is acting. If it bases its activities

on force, it is so far failing as the State which can impose any moral obligation or arrogate any religious sanction. The assent, tacit if not co-operant, of subjects or citizens is a condition of its being an association of persons. In relying on force exclusively, it is treating persons as things; it treats them as persons only when it can command their conscious and voluntary allegiance and support. Force there must be in reserve, but only as a last resort. This does not condemn force as such, for force as physical is morally neutral; its moral character depends on the use which is made of it. Excessive use is violence, unnecessary use is cruelty, and both fall under moral condemnation. The Church may fully recognize, and firmly support the authority of the State when it is rightly based and rightly used; otherwise it may be its sacred obligation to condemn and resist, or to submit under protest.

(4) As religion is not concerned with only one department of life, and the Christian religion especially claims to be the leaven (Mt 13<sup>33</sup>) pervading and transforming the whole lump of human interest and activity, the Church is not concerned only with what is mistakenly distinguished as the sacred from the secular, since the Spirit of God seeks to sanctify 'the whole manhood of all mankind.' Ethical, cultural, and even economic problems in so far as they relate to the full development and free exercise of human personality in its supreme and controlling relation to God must be the concern of the Church, that they may receive as far as the Church's testimony and influence can command nothing other or less than a Christian solution. It is evident that as the function of the State expands, and as the Church's pervasion and transformation of human society extends, they will come into ever closer contact, and it may be into ever acuter conflict. The Church may, being wise as a serpent as well as harmless as a dove (Mt 10<sup>16</sup>), recognize that the legislation and the administration of the State cannot be far in advance of public opinion and popular sentiment, and must often fall short of the Christian standards, and accordingly may abstain from censure or opposition; but it cannot acquiesce and compromise within its own membership; it must insist on the whole demand of Christ so as to give to the world around an example, it must use all its resources to raise the general standard, and it must seek to win men and women from the world around to share its witness and work. Not indifferent or hostile to, but interested in and supporting any activity of the State which is required for and promotes the

common good, in view of the teaching of Christ on the infinite value of the individual soul, the Church must guard individual liberty and responsibility against any unnecessary interference of the State, the motive of which is its own self-aggrandisement, or sectional interests, and not this common good; but it should give no countenance to a factious opposition, which rests only on individual preference; it should in such cases declare submission a duty, and resistance a wrong. Even when the individual conscience defies the authority of the State, it is not always the function of the Church, while defending freedom of conscience, to approve and further every assertion of it; and it is at this point that a wise discrimination is necessary. A general principle may be briefly stated, but the necessary limits of space forbid detailed illustration. If the individual conscience is 'ahead of' the common beliefs and standards, which the State is enforcing, then resistance will be a duty, whatever its penalties may be; if it is 'behind' the State's requirements, repression may become the duty of the State, although tolerance is permissible, if the interests of the community are not imperilled. The Church should stand by the progressive conscience, but give no sanction to the reactionary, while pleading for tolerance where permissible.

## II.

(1) A provisional description of the Church has been given; but we may now enter into fuller detail to show why by necessity of its nature the Church must take up the challenge of the 'totalitarian' State. While men are saved individually, yet as united by faith to Christ as Saviour and Lord, they are at once brought into the Society of the saved, of which the Holy Spirit is the 'common possession' (2 Co 13<sup>14</sup>), and which by that Spirit becomes a community of motive, purpose, witness, service, the body of Christ, in which He dwells, and through which He is fulfilling the divine purpose of the redemption and reconciliation of all mankind. It is His complement, as He is completing all things in all men (Eph 1<sup>23</sup>). To put the same truth in other words, the saving sovereignty of God in Christ (the Kingdom of God) is exercised in the Church in a twofold way; the community of believers is its *object* in order that it may become its *organ*; men are saved that they may serve the divine ends of salvation.

(2) The Church's primary, distinctive function is *soteriological*; it is the agent of God's saving sovereignty. But as it is an *association* of men

with *institutions* in the world of time and space, it has its *sociological* form. Two problems here emerge and call for solution. The one theological-ecclesiastical, the other political-ecclesiastical. (a) Is there so intimate and direct a dependence of the sociological form on the soteriological function, that it can be asserted that only one organization of the Church can claim to correspond to its inspiration, e.g. the threefold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, the apostolic succession, the historic episcopate, or does its unity and continuity as a human society, divinely sustained and guided, not require uniformity, but allow a wide range of adaptation to the local and temporal condition? The seemingly irreconcilable opposition of the 'Catholic' and the 'Protestant' conception is the now seemingly insuperable obstacle to the reunion of the churches, and the present challenge of the State may do good if it brings home the danger of division, and the duty of union. (b) The German situation has raised another problem. It is agreed by the 'German Christians' that while in its *soteriological function* the Church is independent of the State, its *sociological form* should *conform* (*Gleichschaltung*) to that of the State. They are careful to insist on their fidelity to the confessions of the Reformation, but seek to impose on the churches an organization similar to that of the State. This is, of course, consistent with the 'totalitarian' conception; not only shall the State control all associations, but the same principle must be exemplified in their institutions—one race, one nation, one leader, one policy in Church as in State. Accordingly, while Hebrew Christians may retain their membership in the Church, since that is included in the *soteriological* aspect, yet as the ministry is a social institution it belongs to the *sociological* aspect, and so the State policy of exclusion may be defended. To be the people's church (*Volkskirche*) the Church should identify itself with the policy of the State. We may remind ourselves of King James' conviction: 'no bishop, no king.' Adaptation in the Church there must be, but it is an adaptation that will make the Church more effective in the discharge of its distinctive functions, and not a conformity to current prejudices, conveniences, expediencies. With Paul the Church must be 'all things to all men,' not at the behest of the State, but at the command of Christ 'by all means to save some' (1 Co 9<sup>22</sup>).

(3) In the measure in which the Church is the body of Christ, the habitation of His Spirit, it is evident that it cannot be subjected to any human authority; but for its distinctive functions it is



on the one hand subject to the authority of God alone, and on the other the agent of that authority towards men. As regards its property, the relations of its members to one another and to their fellow-citizens, it will recognize the legitimate authority of the State and enjoin obedience for conscience's sake (Ro 13<sup>6</sup>), unless conscience forbids. But in discharge of its function 'by all means to save some,' it can brook no rival. As the purpose of God embraces 'the whole manhood of all mankind,' its authority as exponent of the will of God is universal as human life; no human association, not even the State, can withdraw itself from the authority of God. Its authority is not coercive, but persuasive, constraining; its appeal is to

reason, conscience, spirit; it cannot use force as its last resort, as does the State, but must leave to the judgment of God those who resist the truth, and refuse the grace which it mediates for God and ministers to men. The authority it exercises is not a privilege claimed, but a responsibility accepted, which must be discharged at any cost, martyrdom if need be, for the Cross, and not the Crown, belongs to its regalia. To be worthy and fit to exercise that authority, it must never allow itself to 'be fashioned according to this world,' but must be 'transformed by the renewing of its mind,' by a constant divine inspiration that it may prove and proclaim to the world 'the good and acceptable will of God' (Ro 12<sup>2</sup>).

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Varia.

In view of all that is commonly believed about Germany, it is interesting to find that at least one large book of Jewish origin was published in Berlin last year. This is B. Jacob's extensive commentary on Genesis,<sup>1</sup> a work which commands the respect of every Old Testament student. The author describes himself quite frankly as 'a son of the people for whom the Law was written,' and he takes, naturally and inevitably, a conservative critical position, devoting the last hundred pages of the book to an appendix in which he discusses the methods and results of the normal critical analysis. The translation is arranged almost in individual verses, though often several are taken together, and each verse or group of verses is followed by the comments. These latter show a very wide range of learning, a freedom from racial and theological prejudice, and sometimes a striking originality. Where the translator finds the Hebrew text unintelligible (as in 4<sup>7</sup>), he does not hesitate to say so, though he is not prepared to find a way out of the difficulty through conjectural emendation. He has at his finger-ends the writings of all the great Jewish scholars, and is familiar also with most of the Christian literature on the subject, freely quoting and accepting opinions which appeal to him, from whatever source they may come. Philological notes are abundant, though they are not especially marked off from the rest of the com-

mentary, and they exhibit a rich store of Hebrew knowledge.

The fact that the author is able to take as literal history all that is said of the patriarchs gives him a real advantage in exegesis. For, even if we are not prepared to accept this view for ourselves, we should all admit that it was held by the narrators of the stories as they have come down to us. So we have here, in the exegetical comments, a striking vividness, which often brings before us a new clarity and sharpness of outline. It is as if our vision were, from time to time, focussed with fresh accuracy on the scene before us, and often a light touch reveals the picture as it presented itself to the original writer. This is something which we often miss in modern commentaries on the Pentateuch, and we owe a debt of gratitude to any writer who can recover it for us.

While, then, we may often find ourselves in disagreement with the author, it seems impossible to estimate too highly the learning, the patient research, the conscientious thoroughness, and the insight of this enormous work. Few will want to read it right through, but it will long remain a mine into which a reader may delve with interest and with profit.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

<sup>1</sup> *Das Erste Buch der Tora: Genesis, übersetzt und erklärt* von B. Jacob (Schocken, Berlin, 1934; pp. 105; Rm. 42).

Dr. Werner Betcke, in the preface to his work on *The Social Ethics of Luther*,<sup>1</sup> affirms that the victory of national socialism has made an end of the individualistic era. It is therefore necessary to re-examine Luther's relation to individualism. The Protestantism of the nineteenth century was strongly individualistic and appealed for support to Luther. Dr. Betcke maintains that the Reformer has been unjustly regarded as the great individualist. So distinguished and influential a writer as Troeltsch, it is held, has misinterpreted his teaching in this respect, but a reaction against what has long been the popular view is welcomed in the writings of Holl, Brunner, Gogarten, and others.

Part I. consists of a brief exposition of the concepts of Individualism and Universalism, with special reference to the philosophical bases of the religious systems of the Middle Ages. 'The roots of modern individualism are to be found in the pre-Reformation period; the forces which tend to separate the individual and society were already gaining strength. The germ was there from which modern individualism could develop and actually did develop.'

In Part II. Luther's individualism is expounded in detail. 'Undoubtedly Luther, like the Nominalist and the Humanist, was no Medievalist. He differs from his teachers and pastors inasmuch as his recently-awakened questionings concerning the relation of the soul to God can no longer be quieted by sacramental magic and submission to dogma.' But to charge him with subjectivism, because of his insistence on personal responsibility for faith, is to ignore (1) his teaching that it is impossible to separate faith from love: 'where faith is there neighbourly love is active, and where this love is lacking faith is non-existent'; and (2) his appeal to the authority of the Word of God: 'the Word of God had central significance for his faith, therefore the Church was of importance because therein the Word was preached which alone can awaken faith.'

In subsequent chapters the argument is developed that 'the foundation of the Social Ethics of Luther is the Law of Love'; his ethical principles are then applied to such modern problems as the State, labour, poverty, and marriage. Dr. Betcke's study supplies a cogent corrective of misunderstandings of Luther's teaching; it has special value on account of its copious quotations from a wide range of his works. The references to mysticism, how-

ever, fail to differentiate between its manifold forms. There is a 'practical mysticism' which is not to be identified with individualism.

'Theology for minds educated but not theologically trained' is the substance of Dr. Erich Schaefer's explanation of the title of his work, *A Statement of Faith for the Educated*.<sup>2</sup> It is not a complete system of dogmatics written for theologians, but an exposition of some central doctrines of the Christian faith for readers whose education, scientific or philosophical, has led to their acceptance of non-Christian theories of rationalism or idealism.

After an Introduction stating his aims and methods, Dr. Schaefer expounds the nature, origin, and knowledge of faith. The last-mentioned theme, 'Die Erkenntniss des Glaubens' is treated at length under six headings, all being sub-divisions of the all-inclusive subject, 'the God of Faith.'

As Dr. Schaefer makes special reference to those who misunderstand the Church's teaching concerning the Person of Christ, his chapter dealing with Christology is of exceptional interest. From his theocentric point of view it is entitled 'the God of Almighty Holy Love.' Different conceptions of the love of God, it is maintained, separate those who believe *with* Jesus Christ from those who believe *in* Him, and *through* Him believe in God. The Christology of the New Testament is clearly stated, the Synoptic view being distinguished from the Johannine and from the Pauline. To those who object that St. Paul unduly subordinates the historic Jesus to the exalted Lord, Dr. Schaefer replies: 'Certainly the exalted, ever-present Lord, who had appeared to the Apostle, dominates his thought; but just as certain is it that all that Jesus now is to St. Paul is based on His earthly life. 'The exalted Lord' is the historical Jesus and none other.'

Dr. Schaefer's re-statement of Christian doctrine is well-fitted to commend evangelical truth to those who have misconceived the bearing of current philosophies on the Christian faith. English readers will find that the lucidity of its style makes the book easier to read than the majority of German theological works.

Dr. Schlunk, who is Professor of the Science of Missions in the University of Tübingen, has published a course of lectures entitled *Foreign Leaders*

<sup>1</sup> *Luther's Sozialethik. Ein Beitrag zu Luther's Verhältniss zum Individualismus*, von Dr. Werner Betcke (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; RM.4).

<sup>2</sup> *Glaubenslehre für Gebildete*, von Dr. Erich Schaefer, Professor der Theologie und Geh. Konsistorialrat in Breslau (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; Kart. RM.6.50; geb. RM.8).



and Christianity.<sup>1</sup> He has selected thirteen men and women, leaders in Japan, China, India, Africa, and in the Muhammadan world; of each he gives a biography and describes their life-work, his object being to estimate the influence of Christianity on their ideals and careers.

The leaders chosen include two Japanese: Neesima, an early Christian educationalist, who established a High School and Theological Seminary; Kagawa, the Christian Socialist, 'a great gift of God to Japanese Christianity'; five Indians, Keshub Chunder Sen, Rabindranath Tagore, Mahatma Gandhi, Sadhu Sundar Singh, and Pundita Ramabai. The three first named are included to show how powerfully the example of Jesus has influenced their lives although they did not become Christians; in spite of divergent estimates of the character of Sadhu Sundar Singh, Dr. Schlunk honours him as a great Indian Evangelist, ranking him 'amongst the great ones in the kingdom of God'; tribute is paid to the remarkable work done by Pundita Ramabai among Indian widows and outcast women after she became a Christian.

<sup>1</sup> *Führer fremder Völker und das Christentum*, by Martin Schlunk (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; Kart. M.3, geb. M.4.).

The two Chinese leaders are the Reformers Hung Shu Tsuen and Sun Yat Sen, the former illustrating 'the remarkable mingling of light with darkness which may result from contact with the teaching of Christ,' and the latter furnishing a striking example of the recognition that Christianity must be the basis of national reform, though Sun's followers have not all remained faithful to their leader's principles. Further, three Africans are selected, namely, Bishop Crowther, Mercy Baëta, and Dr. Aggrey; the representative of Islam is Imad ed Din, the scholarly translator and author 'who revealed to Mohammedans the glory of the Christian gospel.'

It would be difficult to overestimate the beneficial results of this course of lectures delivered in the famous German university. Dr. Schlunk has graphically sketched the lives of national leaders of diverse types, but the cumulative effect of the lessons to be derived from their manifold service to humanity is to demonstrate the adaptability of Christianity to every race and to prove that 'the Christian gospel is a powerful factor in modern history.'

J. G. TASKER.

Tunbridge Wells.

## Contributions and Comments.

### Professor J. M. Creed and the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.

In the interests of investigation I should like to refer to the arguments which Professor Creed has used with reference to the Lukan Passion-narrative in his criticism of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.<sup>1</sup>

(1) Professor Creed questions the claim that the Markan material is 'detachable' and would appeal to an editor as an 'enrichment.' 22<sup>19a</sup>, he says, is the only attractive case; 23<sup>26, 34b, 44f.</sup> might be so interpreted 'if the rest of the evidence favoured the view'; 22<sup>47, 50, 52f., 71</sup> 23<sup>3</sup> are rejected.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As the Lukan Passion-narrative is to be examined in the New Testament Series by Dr. A. M. Perry, the author of *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative* (University of Chicago, 1920), I am limiting this discussion to the points Professor Creed has raised.

<sup>2</sup> Other passages which repay attention are 22<sup>22, 74, 46b, 46b-61</sup> 23<sup>35, 50-54</sup> 24<sup>10</sup>. For an examination of all the passages, see *Behind the Third Gospel*, 33-75.

Of these passages I propose to consider only the third, and in Professor Creed's opinion, the least favourable class.

22<sup>47, 50, 52f.</sup> belong to the story of the Arrest. I am far from feeling sure that v.<sup>47</sup> is derived from Mark, but there is no doubt of the Markan origin of v.<sup>50b</sup> ('and struck off his [ear]') and vv.<sup>52-53a</sup> ('... unto the chief priests and ... elders, which were come out against him, Are ye come out, as against a robber, with swords and staves? When I was daily with you in the temple, ye stretched not forth your hands against me'). These passages seem to me to be 'detachable' and 'enrichments,' because their removal leaves a consistent and, in some respects, improved narrative. In *Behind the Third Gospel*<sup>3</sup> I have not claimed this as more than a 'tentative conclusion,' and I am encouraged in holding this opinion by the fact that B. S. Easton has independently arrived at a very similar result.

<sup>3</sup> P. 47. Cf. *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, 197.

'The basis of Lk vv.<sup>47-51</sup>' he observes, 'is L'; and, with reference to <sup>52f.</sup>, he says, 'Lk. supplements L's account with an extract from Mk.'<sup>1</sup>

Little importance, I suggest, can be assigned to <sup>22</sup><sup>71</sup>, since the question 'What further need have we of (witness <sup>2</sup>)?' might well appear in the most independent accounts of the Trial.

<sup>23</sup><sup>3</sup> is studied best when <sup>23</sup><sup>1-5</sup> (cf. Mk 15<sup>1-5</sup>) is read as a whole.

*'And the whole company of them rose up, and brought him before Pilate. And they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king. [And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the king of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest.] And Pilate said unto the chief priests and the multitudes, I find no fault in this man. But they were the more urgent, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judæa, and beginning from Galilee even unto this place.'*

In this passage the Markan words are in italics<sup>3</sup> and <sup>23</sup><sup>3</sup> is enclosed in brackets. Surely the latter, the only Markan element in the section, is 'detachable.' It is also an 'enrichment,' because it shows in what sense Christ is a king and gives force to Pilate's words: 'I find no fault in this man.' But if this is so, in respect of an example which Professor Creed rejects, is it not possible that he understates the facts when he says that <sup>23</sup><sup>26, 34b, 44f.</sup> might be interpreted as insertions 'if the rest of the evidence favoured the view'?

(2) The second objection is that in Lk 21, 'where there is no sufficient reason to postulate a non-Markan source, the proportion of non-Markan words rises far above the average level.' Why should it not be so in 22-24? The difficulty of this argument is that it has not been shown that there is 'no sufficient reason to postulate a non-Markan source' in Lk 21.<sup>4</sup> Until this is done, the contention stands

that 'in the Discourse, as in the Passion narrative, non-Markan matter is given the preference, and into it Markan extracts have been inserted.'<sup>5</sup> It is quite reasonable to suppose that Luke considered it worth while to recast his Markan material in 22-24, if he had a non-Markan source at his disposal. Otherwise, one would expect him to follow Mark closely.

(3) Again, I venture to think that full justice is not done in Professor Creed's article to the fact that the indubitably Markan passages in the Lukan Passion-narrative follow almost exactly the order in which they appear in Mark. This fact has an important bearing upon what he says regarding the views of Sir John Hawkins. Sir John has told us that he came to reject Feine's theory of a pre-canonical Luke because, as the result of closer investigation, he came to think that Luke's free handling of Mark in the Passion-narrative suggests 'a long and gradual conflation in the mind rather than a simple conflation by the pen.'<sup>6</sup> Now if the indubitably Markan passages in Lk 22<sup>14-24</sup><sup>11</sup> follow almost exactly the order of Mark, St. Luke must have deliberately consulted Mark when constructing his own narrative. But in this case Sir John's explanation falls to the ground. The theory of 'a long conflation in the mind' will not account for the twelve variations<sup>7</sup> in the order in which incidents are recorded by Mark and Luke; the variations must be due to a 'conflation by the pen.' I suggest that some of them are due to the contents of St. Luke's special source, and the rest (seven, at least) to the insertion of extracts from Mark.

(4) I turn, lastly, to the suggestion that St. Luke's treatment of the Markan story of the Denial illustrates his power of rewriting and reconstructing Mark elsewhere 'without the help of a parallel narrative.' This idea is attractive, but I doubt if it leads us very far. Wherever the percentage of Markan words is fifty, as it is in the Lukan story of the Denial (22<sup>54b-61</sup>), the suggestion is worth considering. It breaks down, however, when the percentage sinks below twenty-nine, as in the Agony, the Mocking, the Trial before Pilate, the Crucifixion, and the Visit to the Tomb.

The case for a non-Markan Passion-narrative in Luke is cumulative, and can be stated in a sentence. This hypothesis is suggested because, whereas the Markan element is relatively small, its clearest examples are (a) detachable, (b) capable of being regarded as enrichments, (c) present practically in

<sup>5</sup> See *Behind the Third Gospel*, 101-25, where the structure of Lk 21 is discussed in detail.

<sup>6</sup> *Oxford Studies*, 90.

<sup>7</sup> *Ib.* 84-9.

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (1926), 332.

<sup>2</sup> Mark has 'witnesses' (14<sup>63</sup>).

<sup>3</sup> Of the nineteen Greek words in <sup>23</sup><sup>3</sup> no less than sixteen appear in Lk 15<sup>3</sup>, while the seventy words of Lk 23<sup>11</sup> include five words common to Mk 15<sup>1-5</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> It is not shown, for example, in the important article by Dr. Hunkin, to which Professor Creed refers (*The Journal of Theological Studies*, xxviii. 250-62; cf. also xxix. 147-55), nor again by Professor Creed himself in his valuable commentary, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (see pp. 252-4).



the same succession as in Mark, in spite of twelve differences of order in Luke when compared with Mark. Professor Creed says that 'the backbone of the work' is Mark; I should prefer to describe the Markan element as a collection of dis severed vertebrae; but the problem must be left to other investigators.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

*Leads.*

### Gn. i. 22-26, Dt. xxiv. 4-7, Jos. xxiv. 29 ff.

My attention has been drawn to the close resemblance there is, both in matter and construction, in the short summaries appended to the Books of Genesis, Deuteronomy, and Joshua (Gn 50<sup>22-26</sup>, Dt 34<sup>4-7</sup>, Jos 24<sup>29ff.</sup>)—a resemblance sufficient to suggest probability of their having been framed by the same editorial hand.

It will be seen that these passages, occurring at the close of three different books (one, outside the Pentateuch), record respectively the deaths of Joseph, Moses, and Joshua; and that in all three cases their ages and the details of their burial are carefully given. It is especially noticeable that, whereas it is recorded in the passage from Genesis that Joseph was embalmed and put into a coffin in Egypt, the passage from Joshua gives the sequel, and records how, according to his expressed will, his bones were taken up from Egypt, and the burial consummated in his father Jacob's purchased field at Shechem.

I am tempted now to ask whether the hardly accidental resemblance of these three passages to one another may have also attracted the attention of Biblical scholars; and whether inferences of any importance may be deducible from it.

L. B. CHOLMONDELEY.

*Rodington Rectory, Shrewsbury.*

### The Prayer of St. Chrysostom.

A CONTRIBUTOR to the August 1934 issue inquires if, in the Greek Church, this prayer is used under the name of St. Basil, on grounds of doubt as to the orthodoxy of St. Chrysostom?

The Greek Church has no doubt as to the orthodoxy of St. Chrysostom. The prayer is, however, used in the Liturgy of St. Basil, exactly in the same way as in that of St. Chrysostom. A very large part of the two liturgies is common to both, and this prayer belongs to the common part. In the oldest MS. of these liturgies (Barberini of ninth century) the prayer is actually given in St. Basil and not in St. Chrysostom. While this may not mean more than that the copyist did not wish to repeat the common part, it suggests that the prayer is more likely to be St. Basil's than St. Chrysostom's, though it cannot be proved that either of them is the author.

At the period of the Reformation the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom had been (as it still remains to-day) the normal liturgy of the Orthodox Church, that of St. Basil being used only ten times in the year. Cranmer probably translated the prayer from a copy of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, and, accepting the liturgy as authentic, called the prayer 'A Prayer of St. Chrysostom.'

While the English Prayer-Book version of the prayer is nearer the Latin than the Greek, it can hardly be the case that the Prayer-Book version is based on the Latin. The prayer does not occur (at least, so far as I know) in the pre-Reformation Latin services, and so there was no Latin version to base it on. The Latin version was probably translated from the English. The prayer is interesting as being the only formulary in the Prayer-Book translated directly from a Greek original.

HENRY HOLLOWAY.

*Joppa, Midlothian.*

### Entre Nous.

**Under the Bay Tree.**

'Dear good Friend under the Bay Tree,—  
Your charming letter did me good. I have quite  
given up hope of ever hearing from your (good) man,  
(bad)

so I put my trust in you.' So S. R. Crockett wrote to Catherine Robertson Nicoll on July 18th, 1899, and his opening greeting has provided her with a title for the delightful volume of reminiscences she has just published. They cover all her time at



Bay Tree Lodge, Frogna!—from May 1897 when she went there on her marriage and found her two step-children at the door waiting 'to receive us and to give me a piece of shortbread to break and eat as I crossed the threshold,' up to May 1923 when her husband died.

Robertson Nicoll once said in the *British Weekly*, 'Most of us would shrink from writing autobiography, but it is a very natural desire to set down in order some reminiscences or recollections of the people you have known, and the events you have witnessed.' Lady Robertson Nicoll has the requisites of the successful chronicler, for she has an easy and pleasant style, and she was in contact for over twenty-five years with most of the literary men and women of the time. The book gives a delightful picture of their neighbours in Hampstead. There were the St. John Adcocks, Max Pemberton, the Du Mauriers, Pett Ridge, Beatrice Harraden, and others. Dr. Alexander Whyte retired to 22 Church Row, quite close to them. And those who did not live there paid frequent visits. The Dutch novelist, Maarten Maartens, is often at Bay Tree Lodge. Ian Maclaren was a frequent visitor. Dr. Hastings' visits are spoken of: 'Himself a scholar, he had the gift of graciously listening to the most ignorant talker, leading them to feel that he enjoyed their opinions, and that they were worth having.'

Her first letter of congratulation after her engagement was from J. M. Barrie, and the second from Mrs. Burnett Smith (Annie Swan). It is with a smile that we read a sentence from the latter, in which Mrs. Burnett Smith speaks of 'These present irresponsible days' and bemoans the small number who entertain a high ideal of what the marriage estate ought to be. The date of this letter is April 5th, 1897!

There are pleasant accounts of holidays in the Riviera and of summers in Scotland spent in the old manse of Lumsden. These were welcome changes from the busy Hampstead life where Robertson Nicoll in spite of constant poor health turned out his 20,000 words a week, was always starting new enterprises. Lady Robertson Nicoll quotes several amusing skits on his multifarious interests:

'Then Doyle was heard complaining, with resentment and surprise  
That Nicoll put his finger in too many of the pies;  
But Nicoll, with a weary smile, still sampled every course,  
And wondered Doyle should pass him such a quantity of sauce.'

About the same time *Punch* came out with a 'bulletin':

'Distinguished Patients.

Dr. Robertson Nicoll remains in a very critical condition. He complains of plurality and congestion of the organs.'

In private life we see Robertson Nicoll as a devoted father (to his younger daughter Mildred he is 'your very loving Popsy-Wopsy') and a generous husband. 'Another theory of my husband's was that a wife should not be harassed over money, she should be, if possible, trusted with all the funds, stewarding them to the best of her ability. So all cheques were handed to me.' His great interest was people. He cared for places and buildings only because of the people who were associated with them. Churchyards held a fascination for him: 'From interest in the lives of those sleeping there.' . . . 'On a tombstone at Bath, in memory of an old lady who died at the age of one hundred and twelve, he noted that 'during the later years of her life she was distinguished by both virtue and propriety!'

Robertson Nicoll had a number of friends for whom he had a peculiarly close affection, and whose society he cultivated assiduously. T. Herbert Darlow came to see him every Thursday for thirty years; Sir John Adams was a weekly visitor; Canon Anthony Deane, when vicar of Hampstead, was another. And the reminiscences end with a letter from him: 'It is a Saturday afternoon as I write—and, oh, how hard to realise that I cannot go over to Hampstead and mount the stairs to meet again that affectionate welcome.'

*Under the Bay Tree* has been printed for private circulation only, but it is no secret that copies are being bought freely, and may be had from book-sellers in Aberdeen and elsewhere. The price is 7s. 6d. net. In the dress of the volume we see Lady Robertson Nicoll's artistic gifts. The illustrations add greatly to its charm and value, and make it a joy to handle.

#### Answered Prayer.

'Mr. Mann (the Lumsden General Merchant) knew all the people within a wide radius, having grown up amongst them. We were talking one day of answered prayer, and he told the following story: "There was a devout old woman in an outlying cottage—before the days of Old Age Pensions and doles. She was very poor. One day, having no food at all in her little home, she prayed, as was her wont, for help. There came a knock on the



door and a loaf of bread was handed in by the baker's boy. 'What made you think of her?' I asked, guessing who the angel of deliverance had been. Mr. Mann answered, 'I couldn't say. I was working at my accounts when the thought suddenly came to me: Send Mrs. B—a loaf of bread.'"<sup>1</sup>

#### Ploughed Under.

The latest Dohnavur book is *Ploughed Under*, the story of Star, the sister of Mimosa. Amy Carmichael tells the story well, for she has a real literary gift. It begins with Star's search for a God who could change dispositions. She was about to give up the search when one day a sentence repeated several times by one of the Dohnavur preachers who had come to her village caught her attention. '*There is a living God. There is a living God: He turned me, a lion, into a lamb.*' . . . "I will not worship a dead god," she almost spoke aloud in her eagerness. "Siva is a dead god. I will not rub his ashes on my forehead." Then she went slowly home, pondering those luminous words, "*There is a living God: there is a living God.*" Star's is a happy story, the author says. 'It was written for the most part in a little brown house in the heart of a great forest; and for many days there was rain. . . . But every morning, huddled under dripping leaves in the gloom, there were birds that whistled and sang, and the gallant yellow-breasted bulbuls always seemed to be gayest when the grey rods of rain smote the greenwood most sharply. I hope that something of this bird-song has sung through the story. It should, for the way of the Beloved with all His lovers leads straight to the only kind of happiness that is not dependent on fair weather; and He who can make of clay, crystal, and of soft iron, Damascus steel, can enable the least of us for a life, be it a fight in the open or endurance in the shadow, which turns these words to deeds:

'Come ill, come well, the cross, the crown,  
The rainbow or the thunder—  
I fling my soul and body down  
For God to plough them under.

And this, this only, is the way of joy.'

The book is published by the S.P.C.K., and the price is 2s. 6d. net.

#### Fireside Reflections.

The Rev. Charles H. Hodgson of Derby contributes short religious talks to 'The Derby Evening

<sup>1</sup>C. R. Nicoll, *Under the Bay Tree*, 159.

Telegraph.' These have now been collected and published in book form—*Fireside Reflections* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net). Mr. Hodgson's mind is richly stored with literary allusions, and when he says 'I recall' we prepare to listen with enjoyment. We take the liberty of quoting two of his illustrations.

'I recall the philosophy of the aged lodge-keeper, Neddy Joe, in Donn Bryne's delightful story, *Hangman's House*. These are his words: "Master Dermot, when a man dies, he's summed up by this—does he leave a hole in the world?"'<sup>2</sup>

#### Forgiveness.

'I recall a very fine passage in a novel I read a long time ago, *Concerning Isabel Carnaby*. It runs like this: "The teaching of modern philosophy is that what is done is done, and what we have written we have written, and that there is no atonement for the deed once accomplished, and no washing out of the handwriting against us. But I have not so learned Christ."

"Then do you believe that what is done can ever be undone?" asked Paul. "Surely that is impossible."

"I do not wish to prophesy smooth things," replied his father, "nor to sprinkle the way of life with rose-water. I know that if a man breaks the laws of nature he will be punished to the uttermost, for there is no forgiveness in nature. I know that if a man breaks the laws of society he will find neither remission nor mercy, for there is no forgiveness in society; but I believe that if a man breaks the laws of God his transgression can be taken away as though it had never been, for 'there is forgiveness with Thee that Thou mayest be feared.'"

"It is a grand gospel that you preach, father, and seems almost too good to be true."

"Nothing is too good to be true; the truth is the best of everything."'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup>P. 97.

<sup>3</sup>P. 123.

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.